

the kindergarten to the university, but now all kinds of obstacles are to be placed in the way of the poor man's child. I am told on good authority there are, in Perth, institutions taking boys as apprentices to dentistry. Their parents believe those boys are to become practising dentists. The parents are paying premiums for the privilege. Later, when they come to read the articles of apprenticeship, they discover that their boys are apprenticed as mechanics, and will never be able to practise dentistry.

Mr. SPEAKER: The motion will cover that.

Mr. MUNSIE: No, it will not apply to the professions, but the amendment will.

Mr. Underwood: Why worry about professions when you cannot get a bricklayer?

Mr. MUNSIE: Because I want the rising generation to have the same chance of becoming professional men as they have of becoming bricklayers.

Mr. Underwood: And you turn them out labourers!

Mr. MUNSIE: If they turn out good labourers it will not be much to their prejudice. In some professions to-day they are being turned out mere labourers. If the inquiry be extended to the professions, it may do some good.

Mr. Teesdale: It cannot force an employer to teach a boy a trade if he does not intend to.

Mr. MUNSIE: If an employer takes an apprentice he should teach him a trade. I do not want an employer to be compelled to teach a boy if, on trial, the boy proves unsuited for the trade. But if an apprentice shows aptitude for a trade, the employer ought to be compelled to teach him that trade. I hope the House will carry the amendment and will then carry the amended motion.

Mr. LAMBERT (Coolgardie) [10.37]: I compliment the member for East Perth (Mr. Hughes) upon his amendment. The apprenticeship question in Australia is a big subject; in Western Australia it is a pressing one, and as applied to the professions, it is a really serious one, especially for the parent who has had to shell out £200 or £300 by way of premium. It is nearly time Parliament took a hand in the apprenticeship question, not only as applied to bricklayers or carpenters, but as applied to the professions. Dentists have accepted apprentices, knowing that the Dental Act lays it down that, preparatory to being articled as dentists, boys must have passed the junior University examination.

Mr. Underwood: And be able to gabble a bit.

Mr. LAMBERT: I have known registered dentists accept a premium of £150 from working men who believed they were placing their boys in a way to become registered dentists. Under the Dental Act that is impossible. The same thing obtains in the legal profession and others. Parliament should lay it down

as a principle that the only proof to the articling of a boy to his profession is his capacity to serve in his profession. It is a scandal that Parliament should tolerate the payment of extortionate premiums for allowing a boy to be articled in any profession. In the legal profession the premium is a charge upon a lad after he has passed his final examination. Possibly a boy may serve with a legal practitioner and will find after he has passed his final examination that there is a debt standing against him of perhaps £200 or £300.

Mr. Underwood: That is the great Labour movement that looks after the legal professions!

Mr. Munsie: The Labour movement looks after all classes.

Mr. LAMBERT: I will raise my voice in support of the bricklayer, the carpenter, the mason, the bootmaker and anyone else who may be concerned.

Mr. Underwood: You are putting in a pretty good tale for the professional man now.

Mr. Munsie: The amendment deals with the professional man.

Mr. Underwood: It is a fool of an amendment.

Mr. LAMBERT: I hope the House will accept the amendment and that it will prove to be the first step towards wiping out an iniquitous system that has grown up, and that the professional men will realise their obligations more, and see that those who are articled will not be merely those who can pay high premiums.

On motion by the Minister for Agriculture, debate adjourned.

House adjourned at 10.48 p.m.

Legislative Council.

Wednesday, 12th December, 1923.

	PAGE
Bills: Friendly Societies Act Amendment, Assembly's amendments	1968
Stamp Act Amendment, Com., recon.	1969
Yarramony Eastward Railway, 1B.	1970
Loan, £3,763,000, 2B., Com.	1970
Architects, 2B., Com., etc.	1973
Land Act Amendment, 2B., Com., report	1979
Geraldton Harbour Works, 2B., Com., etc.	1985
General Loan and Inscribed Stock Act Continuance, 2B., etc.	1985
Veterinary Surgeons Act Amendment, 2B., etc.	1986
Lake Grace-Newdegate Railway, 2B.	1987
Vermion Act Amendment, 1B.	1989
Loan £3,763,000, Assembly's message, report, 2B.	1993
Adjournment, Special	1994

The PRESIDENT took the Chair at 4.30 p.m., and read prayers.

BILL—FRIENDLY SOCIETIES ACT AMENDMENT.

Assembly's Amendments.

Consideration resumed from the previous day of a schedule of five amendments made by the Assembly in the Bill.

In Committee.

Hon. J. W. Kirwan in the Chair; the Minister for Education in charge of the Bill.

No. 3.—Clause 9, strike out paragraph (6):

On motion by the Minister for Education, the Assembly's amendment was agreed to.

No. 4.—Clause 12, strike out "his," in line 5, and insert "her" in lieu thereof:

THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: I move—

That the amendment be agreed to.
It represents the correction of an error.

Question put and passed; the Assembly's amendment agreed to.

No. 5.—Clause 18, strike out this clause:

THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: I move—

That the amendment be agreed to.

This course seems necessary, because we desire that the Bill shall become law, and anything that might interfere with the prospects of its enactment would not be wise. Clause 18 refers to returns and information to be furnished to the Registrar of Friendly Societies by the secretaries of these societies.

Hon. J. DUFFELL: I am greatly surprised at the Minister's suggestion. Apparently our reasons for inserting this clause are not to be taken into consideration simply because a majority of another place hold views different from ours. No reason has been given why the clause should be deleted. We compromised on the original clause, which was somewhat drastic. The compromise was the result of a conference with the Colonial Secretary, and I thought it would have met with the ready approval of another place. True, the clause as it stands requires the sending in of certain returns, but not the full returns demanded by the original clause. Under the Interpretation Act, having regard to the meaning given to the word "company" in the Life Assurance Act, it is already a contravention of the law for these societies not to render the returns required by the clause. Undoubtedly the members of these societies are joined together for mutual advantage, and therefore returns must be rendered to the Registrar of Friendly Societies. For their own safety that course is essential. In searching for reasons why another place rejected the clause, I found it had been stated that private societies did not concern the registrar. Further, the question was asked why the Government should desire the power to get these returns when the subject did not concern them at all. My contention is that any society having for

its object the raising of funds for the purpose of alleviation in times of sickness and death should render returns with a view to ensuring the safe operation of the funds. Again, it has been urged that the funds raised by the employees of certain Government institutions should not be subject to the rendering of returns, because those funds are controlled by committees and every provision is made for their safety, all things being subject to the closest scrutiny. If that is so, what can be the objection to furnishing returns to the Registrar of Friendly Societies? I fail to see that we should accept the views of another place. I move, as an amendment to the Minister's motion—

That the Assembly's amendment be not agreed to.

THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: Mr. Duffell has entirely misunderstood me. The only reason I moved that we should accept the Assembly's amendment was that, although the session is drawing to a close, I was hopeful the Bill would thus become law. If the hon. member thinks his amendment will not jeopardise the Bill, well and good. I still think the wiser course would be to accept the Assembly's amendment, see how the Bill works and, if any amendments be found necessary, they can be made next session.

Hon. J. CORNELL: Clause 18 proposes to make every friendly society subservient to the registrar. It means greater advantage to the registrar and to the department. Some voluntary organisations have been in existence for nearly a quarter of a century. The clause will apply to all voluntary societies now in existence and to others yet to be created. It is quite unnecessary that such societies should be brought under the registrar. I hope the Committee will agree to the Assembly's amendment.

Hon. E. H. HARRIS: On the second reading I took exception to Clause 18 and asked the reason for it. The Minister said the Government wanted it for statistical purposes alone. Later, the Minister moved an amendment to exclude organisations whose funds are administered from the Eastern States. In my view, if the Government want the provision for statistical purposes they should embrace all societies, wheresoever administered. Only on such a condition would I be prepared to vote for Clause 18.

Hon. J. E. DODD: It would be folly to jeopardise the Bill for the sake of Clause 18. The proposal of the registrar, as embodied in the Bill, was wrong and served only to frighten a lot of the societies. The registrar's subsequent amendment does not seem to have been made in the best possible manner. I still think something should be done to regulate the funds of the societies.

THE CHAIRMAN: The best course for Mr. Duffell to pursue will be to vote against the motion of the Minister that the Assembly's amendment be agreed to. I will prescribe that

course and, overlooking Mr. Duffell's amendment, put the Minister's motion.

Question put and passed, the Assembly's amendment agreed to.

Resolutions reported, the report adopted, and a message accordingly returned to the Assembly.

BILL—STAMP ACT AMENDMENT.

In Committee.

Resumed from the previous day. Hon. J. W. Kirwan in the Chair; the Minister for Education in charge of the Bill.

Bill reported with amendments.

Recommittal.

On motion by Hon. J. Nicholson, Bill recommitted for the purpose of further considering Clause 3.

Clause 3—Amendment of Section 73:

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: I move an amendment—

That in line 4 "already" be struck out.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: I should like your ruling, Mr. Chairman, as to whether the Bill is in order. We have been challenged by the Assembly that we have done something wrong, and that this is a money Bill we had no power to amend. If it is a money Bill, it must have been introduced into another place by a Message from the Governor, and under our Standing Orders a certificate to that effect should be upon the Bill. The original Bill contains no such certificate, and its introduction was not preceded by a Message from the Governor recommending it. Therefore, it is either out of order now, or the procedure we adopted the other day was in order. It is either a money Bill, or it is not. If it is, it cannot be considered in this House without the certificate to which I have referred. If it is not a money Bill, we were within our rights in amending it.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: This point has been raised before on one or two other occasions. It is, however, a pity to raise it now, for this is merely a small continuance Bill. That portion of it Mr. Nicholson desires to amend does not affect the money clauses. It would be wise if the hon. member reconsidered the position he has taken up, although he may be perfectly right in his objection. I hope the Government will not be obliged to introduce another Bill this session.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: I had thought of raising this point, but decided not to do so. Rightly speaking we can absolve anyone from blame in this matter, for under Section 46 of the Constitution Act, as amended, we can with a great deal of force contend that this is not a money Bill. Standing Order

239 also bears out this contention. We must be guided by our Standing Orders, which lay down the course of action when we are altering or repealing a duty. The question is whether it is a money Bill under our Standing Orders.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: I am not taking a technical objection with a view to defeating the Bill. I concur in what you, Sir, and the President did the other day in passing the Bill through. We were right in the course of action we took. Apparently we have been castigated by another place for having the effrontery to deal with a Bill we were not entitled to deal with, and we are now going through a procedure that is practically an admission on our part that we cannot deal with such a Bill. If we have done anything wrong, the Assembly has contributed to our wrong-doing by sending us a money Bill without the necessary certificate. I do not, however, desire to press the objection.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: I appreciate the statement of Mr. Lovekin that he does not intend to press this matter, although the fact that the Bill is not endorsed by a certificate from the Governor might be sufficient evidence to rule it out of order as a money Bill.

Hon. V. HAMERSLEY: The Legislative Assembly has castigated us for improper procedure with respect to this Bill. I contend we had a perfect right to deal with it as we did, under Standing Order 178. We should not accept the castigation of another place when we are in order in what we have done.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: I, too, would like your ruling, Mr. Chairman. It is possible this House has been led into a trap by the absence of a certificate.

Hon. F. E. S. WILLMOTT: Is it not a fact that it is necessary for a Bill to be accompanied by a Message from the Governor only when it is one referring to loans, or the power to raise loans. I do not think it is necessary to have a Message when it is a matter of taxation.

Hon. J. Nicholson: This is a duty.

Hon. F. E. S. WILLMOTT: In a matter of imposing taxation it is not necessary to have a communication from His Excellency.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: If we press for a ruling, we may get one that the Bill is not in order as a money Bill. I do not desire to press that point, because it will mean the loss of the Bill. Having drawn attention to the fact that the Bill does not comply with our Standing Orders, we can let the matter drop.

Hon. J. CORNELL: I do not think another place doubted our mentality, or desired to affront us. We are dealing with this Bill as an ordinary Bill, and we made certain amendments to it. It was then returned to the Assembly which claimed we had adopted the wrong procedure, in that we should have requested it to make the amendments we

desired. There is no need for us to get up on our hind legs on this matter. Let us request the Assembly to make what amendments we desire.

Amendment put and passed.

Hon. J. CORNELL: In my opinion we have adopted the wrong procedure. The amendment should have been put in the form that we "request the Assembly" to agree to the amendment suggested.

The CHAIRMAN: That will be the form in which the new clause will be finally placed before the Assembly.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: I move a further amendment—

That after "paid" in line 6 the words "after the commencement of the principal Act" be inserted.

Amendment put and passed; the clause, as amended, agreed to.

Bill reported with amendments and a message accordingly forwarded to the Assembly requesting them to make the amendments, leave being given to sit again on receipt of a message from the Assembly.

BILL—YARRAMONY EASTWARD RAILWAY.

Received from the Assembly and read a first time.

BILL—LOAN (£3,763,000.)

Second Reading.

Debate resumed from the previous day.

Hon. W. CARROLL (East) [5.20]: I do not intend to traverse the whole of the Loan Estimates but to deal with only one or two points. Certain amounts set out in the schedule to the Bill, have been allocated for various works. One of the first relates to the provision of water supplies in the country districts. The amount provided is small when we take into consideration the amount of work ahead of the Government if they intend to deal with the problem in the way that is necessary. As to the amount of work to be done by the money appropriated under the Bill, hon. members should remember that some little time ago the question of water supplies in the country was acute. At that time a deputation waited on the Premier who stressed the fact that it was very difficult for the Government to do anything because the departmental estimates for the work to be done were so high. We requested the Government to undertake a scheme to excavate a large number of dams in the country as had been done many years ago on the goldfields with such fine results. The Premier produced estimates that had been furnished to him by the Public Works Department indicating that the cost of sinking a 5,000 yard dam would be upwards of £2,400 or nearly 10s. per cubic yard. Private individuals were then getting dams sunk for from 1s. 6d. to 1s. 9d. per cubic

yard in the same class of country and under similar conditions.

Hon. G. W. Miles: That is the difference between day labour and contract system.

Hon. W. CARROLL: It shows the difference between private enterprise and departmental work. From time to time it has been stated that representatives of country districts are always clamouring for works and asking the Government to incur expenditure in their districts, while at the same time evidencing unwillingness to agree to the Government securing revenue to meet the cost of those works. On the other hand, we wish to point out that much of the money expended is not in the best interests of the State and little value is received for the money so expended. We all realise that the question of water supplies, whether in the city or in the country, is of the first importance to the people who can get along without many things, but cannot get on without water. Not long since, I saw a model of an invention by a man who lives, I believe, at Cannington. He estimated that with a machine manufactured along the lines of his model, he could at a cost of £12 per day, excavate dams at the rate of 1,200 to 1,500 cubic yards per day, which would work out at about £1 per 1,000 cubic yards. That gentleman handed his model over to the State Implement Works and I believe the Engineer-in-Chief has reported favourably on it, while the engineers at the State Implement Works are of the opinion that the invention is practicable. In view of the seriousness of the financial position and the still more serious position in the country districts, owing to the shortage of water, the Government should take every possible step to ascertain whether the invention will do what the man claims for it. I am not prepared to say that it will do so. If, on the other hand, it does only half what the inventor claims for it, it will provide a tremendous advance on anything we have on the market at the present time. If put into operation it would be an inestimable boon to the State. I do not know the man from Adam and am not, therefore, pushing his invention forward in his interests. There is another point relating to water supplies in the districts. It is often asked why farmers do not provide water supplies for themselves. In many agricultural areas rain is precipitated in comparatively light individual falls. It is sufficient to enable the country to grow good crops, but is not sufficient to cause the water to run along the surface. Unless the catchment available is good, the farmer is not able to conserve water, particularly those who are not conversant with the pioneering stages of settlement, pastoral or agricultural. Several comparisons have been made regarding the money provided in the Loan Bill for water supplies in the country and in the city. A statement was made last night regarding members representing country districts falling victims to the clever practices of a metropolitan member, inasmuch as they had voted against the metropolitan water supply re-

gulations earlier in the session. If you will remember, Mr. President, the attitude we adopted on that occasion was one of protest against the Government supplying water to sporting bodies at a rate cheaper than they supplied it to industrial concerns. It was on that ground that we voted against the regulations referred to. It was not with the intention of depriving the Government of revenue so badly needed. I think I am right in saying that the Government had the power to frame fresh regulations the very minute those I refer to were disallowed. I am glad to see provision made for an agricultural college. That institution is bound up with the proper education of the youth of this State. Some little time ago questions were asked regarding the provision of an agricultural college and only recently a question was asked in another place as to the site of the proposed institution. I remind hon. members that the present Government some little time ago appointed a committee of experts to inspect the various sites available and to report to the Government as to the best site for the college whenever the Government were in a position to erect it. That committee went exhaustively into the matter and recommended one site as pre-eminently suitable for the purpose. I hope that when the Government deal with this matter they will carry out the recommendations of their own committee. It does not matter what any private member may think; I hold that when the Government appoint a committee of experts to go into any question and that committee takes whatever evidence is available and makes a recommendation accordingly, it is the duty of the Government to give effect to that recommendation. I trust it will be done on this occasion if the site then selected be still available. The recommendation was made some time ago. If the site be not still available the Government should consider the question of establishing the college on portion of the Avondale estate that they still hold. It is a very fine district and no expense would be involved for the site. Many comparisons are being made between the wheat yield of this State and the yields obtained in the Wimmera district of Victoria, much to the disparagement of our farmers. I know something of the Wimmera district. I was reared there and lived there until I came to Western Australia. I lived alongside what is now the Longeronong Agricultural College. I saw the first load of timber go on to the ground. At that time the wheat yields of the Wimmera district were no better than are those of Western Australia to-day. For quite a number of years after the college was built there was no great improvement in the wheat yields. It was only after many experiments had been conducted at the college and applied by the farmers that the yields began to improve, and to-day are the envy and despair of the rest of Australia.

Hon. J. Duffell: Why the despair?

Hon. W. CARROLL: Because elsewhere the farmers have been unable to approach them.

Hon. J. Duffell: That should be encouraging.

Hon. W. CARROLL: Some people say hard things about the land of Western Australia, but from my experience of the Wimmera and of Western Australia, I consider there is just as good land here. When our farmers get down to work in the same way as have the Wimmera farmers, we shall produce equally good crops. The improvement in the Wimmera yields is due to the teachings of the agricultural college, and to the application of the lessons learned from a long series of experiments at the college and the farm attached to it. I have not the slightest doubt that a like result will follow the establishment of an agricultural college here, but the results here will come much more quickly than they did in the Wimmera. Recently we have been told that Western Australia is spending far too much money on the education of its young people. Money wisely expended on education is the finest investment we can make.

The Minister for Education: Do you think the money is being wrongly expended by the Education Department?

Hon. W. CARROLL: I do not say so. Bearing in mind the peculiar state of development, I think education should be directed to lines that would give us the quickest possible returns. What we need more than anything else is ready money. If we can direct our education to develop the lines that will give us money and bring the State to prosperity, we shall be doing the best thing for the State. If we spend a little more money in education along the lines of increasing the productivity of our soils, whether as affecting wheat, wool, or anything else, prosperity will quickly follow and the State will be able to turn the corner. It is a fine thing to have a free university, but the bulk of the students are compelled to seek employment outside the State. We are losing, not only the cost of educating them, but also useful citizens. We educate them in a way that makes it impossible for them to find profitable employment for their talents. I am not speaking in a spirit of carping criticism, but this is a point that might well be considered. If we could increase our wheat yield by three or four bushels an acre, it would make a tremendous difference to the State. Only by education can this be done. I do not intend to speak about the Peel estate, because that will be the subject of an inquiry. A while ago I visited the group settlements at Denmark, and was greatly impressed with the tremendous quantity of fine timber on the properties being cleared. The foreman in charge said if he could get it to a small spot mill, he could cut all the timber required for building the houses. When I tell members that £20 per cottage was charged for carting the material from the Denmark station to the settlements, they will realise what a considerable saving could have been effected had it been possible to carry out this suggestion. The man had had considerable experience of sawmills. There is another aspect of group

settlement that is not sufficiently stressed. The maximum area cleared on each holding is 25 acres, and the settlers are advised to engage in dairying and pig-raising. Anyone with a knowledge of dairying knows that to maintain a milk supply from 10 cows, it is necessary to have 30 to 40 head of cattle, that is, counting dry cows and young heifers. Though the holdings may reach that stage eventually, it will be some years before the pastures become sufficiently set to carry the necessary number of stock. This point, I think, has not been sufficiently considered. We occasionally read in the Press disparaging references to outside influence, but I can quote an instance where the interference of responsible bodies had a good effect. The Government dairy expert divided the State with a blue pencil into about three compartments, and said only Jerseys, Shorthorns, and Guernseys should be stocked. Ayrshires were not shown on the map at all.

Hon. V. Hamersley: Nor Frisians?

Hon. W. CARROLL: That is so. Another fine breed excluded was the Red Poll, to which breed belonged the cow that had the honour of first producing in Australia 1,000 lbs. of butter in a year. Yet under this man's arbitrary act, approved by the Minister, Red Polls were to be kept off the map. The Royal Agricultural Society and the association to which I belong protested, and the decision was altered, with great benefit to the State. I mention this because we read so much in the Press about outside influence being harmful to the Government.

Hon. A. Burvill: Did the dairy expert consult the districts and the Agricultural Society before making the allocation?

Hon. W. CARROLL: The Agricultural Society had nothing to do with the allocation, but protested against it.

Hon. A. Burvill: It was made without consulting any of the districts except those around Perth.

Hon. W. CARROLL: When Mr. Stewart was speaking on railway questions Mr. Cornell interjected that the department were carrying super. for the farmers at a very low rate. I believe the same thing applies to ore being carried from the goldfields. I know it used to be so. It is infinitely better for the Government to carry ore at a low rate and earn some revenue than to run the trucks empty. Theoretically, at any rate, sending super. into the country is like casting one's bread upon the waters: every ton of super. used is going to produce revenue for the railways in the following year. It has been said that the farmers are anxious to have migrants brought from the Old Country in order that they might get cheap labour.

Hon. E. H. Gray: Which is happening.

Hon. H. Stewart: Not farmers, but people generally.

Hon. W. CARROLL: As a farmer I applied the remark to myself. In every trade there is an apprenticeship. One cannot walk into a joiner's shop, take up the tools, and be a

first class joiner straight away. The same applies to farming. Even the most experienced farmers in the State realise that they are only touching the fringe of the business. Labourers coming out to Western Australia do so in the hope that one day they will have farms of their own, and if they have anything of the British spirit in them—bad and all as it sometimes seems, it is the finest in the world—they will succeed. The position is that they hope to become farmers themselves some day. I know a good many of them that started down very low, but did not remain low very long, and to-day some are successful farmers. A few words about tramways before I conclude. Mr. Stewart made out a good case on the subject of tramways the other day, but I may submit something that perhaps he does not know of. It is this, that if he lived where he would require to use the Beaufort-street line, he would know that if the line were put into a condition of proper repair, it would mop up all the profits that the route had shown during the past five years. I have a recollection of Mr. Scaddan making a statement some years ago that it was intended to relay the line from Beaufort-street bridge to Walcott-street. I believe it was relaid as far as Newcastle-street, but beyond that one need not travel more than a couple of chains without noticing pieces of steel between the flanges. In fact it is not safe to travel along this route. I believe that the rails used in connection with the Como extension were originally intended for Beaufort-street. That, of course, is only an expression of opinion. The position is that if the line were put into a decent state of repair to make it thoroughly safe for traffic, all its profit would be used up, and something more in addition. There is no desire on our part to harass this or any other Government by requests for the expenditure of public moneys in the country districts, but we do think that if the Government were alive to their own interests, they would try to make attractive life and conditions in the country, which to-day are such that human beings cannot exist under. In regard to group settlements, houses are provided at a cost of £180. Of course they cannot be mansions for that amount, but we must bear in mind that under the Agricultural Bank Act a farmer in the agricultural areas is allowed only £30 with which to build a house. So we have a distinction which is not justified. A Government that is supposed to govern for all alike should not be a party to distinctions of this kind. If they can spend money as I have pointed out for one class of settler, they should do it for others and make the conditions of living fairly equal.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES (North) [5.50]: The last speaker concluded his remarks by stating that the Government should govern for all. I wish to point out, as it is my duty to do as a representative of the North Province, that the North is receiving very little of the loaves and fishes. The Bill proposes to raise

£3,763,000 for public works, and the voice of the members representing the North is as a voice crying in the wilderness. Still, it is our duty, whenever the opportunity offers, to draw attention to the treatment that is meted out to the northern part of the State, a country that, according to the Minister, is so full of possibilities. Turn to the schedule and we find that out of the £3,763,000, provision is made for the expenditure of a sum of money on one item alone, the "completion of the Ashburton jetty, £70,000." Anyone who knows anything about the North-West must admit that that jetty should have been built 25 years ago. The North is full of possibilities, and when submitting the Appropriation Bill the Minister explained what those possibilities were. Yet we find that we are to get £70,000 for a jetty that ought to have been constructed a quarter of a century ago. The only other matter to which I desire to refer is Clause 7, which provides that the Government may raise money by Treasury bills to pay interest. The objection I have to that clause is that the time to pay the interest is now, and the way to pay it is out of revenue. It is not fair to any Government that may follow, be it Country Party, Labour Party, or any other, that they should be saddled with the responsibility of meeting an obligation that should be met to-day out of revenue and from no other source. An individual or a company that borrows money to pay expenses or interest can have only one end. After all, a State is only a combination of individuals, and what an individual cannot do a combination of individuals cannot do. Debts should be paid when they fall due; they should not be passed on for some other Government to pay. In justice to the people I represent, I felt I was in duty bound to draw attention to the treatment meted out to the northern part of the State that had allocated to it a Commissioner to control it and a tropical expert to advise in regard to its development, and the only item we find in the loan schedule refers to the completion of a jetty that should have been built 25 years ago.

Hon. H. STEWART (South-East) [5.55]: The second schedule shows that a considerable sum has been set apart for the Perth-Fremantle-Cottesloe deviation. The sum on the original loan schedule was £80,000, and the amount to be reappropriated is £72,743. I would like to know from the leader of the House what this refers to. It has not come under my notice previously. What is the proposal now, and why is it desired to have this reappropriation? What were the previous proposals in regard to the deviation, and in what way have they been modified? What are the plans that the Government have in view? I see that the matter dates back to 1915, before I became a member of the House. Hon. members are aware that in con-

nection with the Loan Estimates in the past we were always pushed for time, more so than in the present session, and we did not have the opportunity to look at details of this description.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: That deviation is in connection with the proposed extension of the harbour.

Hon. H. STEWART: I am glad to receive that information from the hon. member, but if the Minister has any reply to make I shall be glad to have it as well.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: I am always trying to help the Minister.

Hon. H. STEWART: We all try to help the Minister so far as we can and according to our convictions. Regarding the second and third schedules, I wish to express appreciation of the fact that I find reappropriated in the second schedule an amount of £50,000 previously authorised in connection with the Jarnadup-Denmark railway, and that in the third schedule there has been reallocated that sum in two equal amounts for the Albany-Denmark railway extension and the Bridgetown-Jarnadup railway extension. The amount, however, is so small compared with the estimates of construction given to us that I am astonished to find that we have not been asked to vote a bigger sum. As I asked some questions earlier in the session regarding group settlements, I trust members will bear with me if I offer a few remarks on that subject. They will be brief and will be offered in no spirit of condemnation of the Government, but purely to put before the House in concrete form some of the conclusions I have arrived at after having considered the figures furnished by the Government. I shall also offer my remarks in a spirit of hopefulness and will place them before the Leader of the House so that he, as a member of Cabinet, having a full voice in the counsels and decisions of Cabinet, may submit them to his colleagues. If my remarks prove to be of any value, and will tend to improve the position in connection with administration, no one will be better pleased than myself. It may be helpful if I read one or two extracts from a speech made by the late Leader of the House during the early part of last session. I wish to do so, because it seems to me that some of the group settlements are already in a difficult position in respect of the amount of their indebtedness. On page 545 of last session's "Hansard" the late Leader of the House is reported as saying—

When the agreement came to be finalised, the Premier realised that if we were going to have an average cost of £750, we must not definitely pin ourselves down to £750 as a maximum. It is not a matter of the Commonwealth or of the State Government advancing £750 per settler

or £1,000 per settler. Neither of those questions enters into consideration. It is a matter of the State undertaking to settle the 6,000 people on the land, and of settling out in the agreement how we propose to do it and what is to be charged against them. In no case will we raise a debit charge against any of those settlers exceeding £1,000. . . The difference between £750 and £1,000 is not a matter of importance. It is not a question of advancing so much per settler, but a question of £750 having been decided between the Premier and the Prime Minister as the average cost, and in the agreement we stipulate that we will not place a debit against any one settler of more than £1,000.

On page 549 Mr. Colebatch is reported as follows:—

We provide in a general way—some of this is arbitrary—for bringing 25 acres under the plough, for fencing, for a house adequate and cheap, for ploughing the land, for laying down 20 acres of pasture and five acres in root and vegetable crops, and, later, five acres for apples. The stock is to consist of cows, pigs, and poultry. Very little machinery will be required. Dairying will be the basis of settlement, with the necessary side lines. Butter and bacon factories will be provided as necessity arises.

There we have in concrete form the proposals of the Government for group settlement. With regard to those proposals we heard the Leader of the Country Party say not so long ago, and without giving any details, "It is all so very simple that I suppose you cannot understand it." I am bringing these proposals into concrete form with a view to showing the position as it stood at the 30th June. On page 553 Mr. Colebatch is reported as follows:—

After all, £6,000,000 is not very much to spend in this country over that period (five years), particularly when compared with the enormous amount of money spent during the war purely for destructive purposes. Surely we can find this money which is necessary from the point of view of a world that requires food, and we will find it necessary to expend money on the development of our idle lands, which must be used.

Those words, to my mind, put a position which must appeal to everybody. Later Mr. Colebatch stressed the fact that for successful settlement the provision of markets was essential. He pointed out that that feature must be included in the scheme. But we have heard no concrete proposals from that aspect. I offer these remarks in no spirit of antagonism to the group settlements or the Government. From what I have seen of the group settlements I am quite satisfied that the group system is the only way to settle that part of our country. In view of the

figures available on the 30th June, however, it is well to pause and consider whether we cannot improve the administration of the scheme both from the standpoint of the general taxpayer, who will have to make good any deficiency, and from the standpoint of the group settler, so that he will not be overloaded. Let us give all possible thought to obtain efficient administration, and let us use all our forethought so that our plans may be laid well ahead for the future. Reverting to the figures furnished up to the 30th June, I recall the present Leader of the House, when he spoke on the Appropriation Bill, saying that in round figures £637,000 had so far been spent on the group settlements, and that of this amount £300,000 had been expended on the Peel estate, and £50 on the provision of roads around the South-West group settlements.

The Minister for Education: Those figures were approximate. I gave the exact figures the next day.

Hon. H. STEWART: I am not criticising the Minister's figures. As at the 30th June last £450,000 had been spent on the group settlements. On the first page of the return which has been provided there are summaries of groups 1 to 63, showing the total expenditure in connection with each group. There is some further expenditure in connection with the blocks, and with what is called the old group 50. In those separate allocations to the different groups a total of £381,174 11s. 1d. had been spent, representing approximately 85 per cent. on the basis of the total expenditure, which was £450,538. Besides the £381,174 which had been allocated to the individual groups, there was a general expenditure of slightly under £66,000. That amount of £66,000 represents roughly 15 per cent. of the total expenditure on the basis of £450,000, and it represents about 18 per cent. on the £381,174 allocated to the groups. There are two tables in Parliamentary paper No. 81, and I have taken the two tables together and done some tabulating. If my figures prove of use to the Minister or to hon. members, I shall consider that my time has not been wasted. On group 1 there are 20 settlers, and 176 acres have been cleared at a cost of £25 per acre. The figures mean that 8¼ acres per member have been cleared. I take it, naturally, that group 1, being the earliest, would necessarily show the highest cost. The average per settler in the case of group 1 works out at approximately £839. Then there is the 18 per cent. to be allocated for general charges.

Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.

Hon. H. STEWART: Before proceeding to give these tabulated results, I want to say that whenever I have asked for information

on group settlements, it has been readily forthcoming—

GROUP SETTLEMENT AS AT 30TH JUNE, 1923.

Approximate figures compiled from Paper No. 81 laid on the Table of the Legislative Council.

Group No.	Locality.	Acres Cleared.	Average Cost per acre.	No. of Houses.	Average Cost per House.	Acres Cleared per Member.	Total Cost per Member.
1	Manjimup	1704	29 0 0	20	180	84	839
2	Jarnadup...	137	28 0 0	17	205	8	750
3	Augusta	168	31 0 0	13	195	13	850
5	Manjimup	212	18 0 0	20	203	104	750
8	Pemberton	143	20 0 0	21	193	7	700
10	Manjimup	144	22 0 0	21	186	7	600
19	Manjimup	87	16 0 0	19	201	44	500
29	Peel Estate	558	2 0 0	20	235	28	540
30	Do. ...	410	4 0 0	22	235	184	400
35	Do. ...	593	3 0 0	21	235	29	300
39	Do. ...	314	3 10 0	20	235	16	305
40	Denmark...	24	15 5 0
41	Do. ...	69	19 0 0
50	Peel Estate	195	4 7 4	21	235	9	...

* Total cost per member includes the cost of member's house, but to cover general charges 174 per cent. of the figures in this column must be added to obtain the total cost per member; 160 acres of land is allotted to each member under the Group Settlement.

I think these figures, with the preliminary statement I read, will bring the position clearly before the Minister, showing him that in a number of instances the maximum charge against settlers, indicated by the ex-Leader of the House last session, has been reached. As for Clause 7, I have already referred to that when speaking on another Bill. I will support the second reading.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION (Hon. J. Ewing—South-West—in reply) [7.45]: I intend to ask the House to meet to-morrow morning at 11 o'clock.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: Do not keep us too late to-night.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: I cannot promise members that. We have done very little business so far to-day, but if we get along well to-night, we shall not be kept too late. I shall have an opportunity, when replying on the Appropriation Bill, to answer the various interesting points raised by Mr. Carroll and Mr. Stewart this afternoon. I somewhat hurriedly moved the second reading of this Bill in the hope that the House would agree to it. The conditions appertaining in Western Australia and the negotiations that are pending seemed to warrant the quick passage of this Bill through the House. I shall have an opportunity of explaining Clause 7 when in Committee. Members have decided views concerning this, and they may desire to make a request of another place.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Hon. J. W. Kirwan in the Chair; the Minister for Education in charge of the Bill.

Clauses 1 to 6—agreed to.

Clause 7—Power to issue Treasury Bills in respect of interest payable under a certain debt to the Commonwealth:

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: I move an amendment—

That the Assembly be requested to omit this clause from the Bill.

The clause provides that the Government may borrow money with which to pay interest. This is a most vicious principle, and if carried out to any extent must lead to great disaster. Disaster would assuredly follow if it were adopted in commercial or private life. The House must be unanimously of my view that we should at least draw the attention of the Assembly to the fact that the clause is in the Bill. It was just a chance through you, Sir, that this was discovered in the Bill, and the clause may have passed through the Assembly without its importance being recognised. If we adopt this principle it will possibly be used as a precedent hereafter by Treasurers, who may wish to show a fictitious statement of their finances, and how clever they are in reducing deficits, and who may begin to bring in Loan Bills for the borrowing of money with which to pay interest. We should not allow this to go through without drawing the attention of the Assembly to it.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: If we adopt this it will ultimately become a pernicious practice, assuming that this is not one. The clause provides that the sum of £140,000, due for interest, shall not be paid now, but that Treasury bills shall be issued spread over a period of not more than 10 years, and that these bills shall become a charge upon the revenue for that term. The only honest method for the Government to adopt is to face the debt that is justly due, and pay it out of Consolidated Revenue, leaving succeeding Governments to do the same thing. The next Government will be faced with much more difficult problems than this, and they will have to face them if we handle this clause as it should be handled. The only straightforward and honourable way is to meet the difficulty when it arises, and carry out the obligations at the due date, which is now. This payment has come upon the Government from some previous Government. As sure as the sun rises to-morrow we know that this Government will pass on far more serious obligations than this to the next Government to honour, and in all fairness the Government of to-day should honour this debt. It will be for this House to see that they do so.

Hon. A. Lovekin: It is very hard upon them.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: I agree with the action proposed by Mr. Lovekin.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: It will take years to find out the truth of the

statement made by Mr. Holmes, that the present Government will hand over greater responsibilities than this to future Governments. I see nothing to justify that remark.

Hon. G. W. Miles: What about the depreciation on State trading concerns?

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: The present Government have unfortunately inherited this monetary obligation. In 1914-15 an amount of £3,100,000 was loaned to this State by the Federal Government for certain purposes. The rate of interest upon the loan was 4½ per cent. The understanding arrived at between the Federal Government and the State Governments, to whom money was loaned under these conditions, was that if the rate of interest proved to be higher than 4½ per cent., the State Governments would agree to pay it. Quite recently the Government were informed by the Federal authorities, and a demand for payment made, that the rate per cent. would be £4 14s. 5d., a difference of 11s. 11d. per cent. The amount has now practically reached £140,000. The payment is spread over a number of years. If the interest had been paid, as suggested by Mr. Holmes and Mr. Lovekin, it would have represented a sum of between £17,000 and £20,000 per annum, but it was not paid. This has now come like a bolt from the blue to State Governments, and the money has to be found. The matter was fully considered at the recent Premiers' conference. It was not thought that the demand for payment would be made immediately. In the ordinary course of events it would not have been made until 1925. That is the year on which the Commonwealth loan falls due. Some adjustment, therefore, has to be made. The Premier of this State requested that the payment might be spread over a period of 10 years. That question has not yet been settled, but he hopes that the request will be agreed to. When the matter of the £140,000 is adjusted, either by direct payment or by Treasury bills, the £4 14s. 5d. interest will be paid from revenue. It is not fair to ask the Government to find the £140,000 at present. The Premier has thought out a scheme which seems to be in the interests of the State, and has offered the Federal Government Treasury bonds covering the amount of £140,000. After that is settled, the policy of the Government will be to pay the interest from revenue as it becomes due.

Hon. H. Stewart: What about the interest on the Treasury bonds?

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: Interest, of course, would have to be paid upon them.

Hon. A. Lovekin: At what rate?

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: At not more than 5½ per cent., the ruling rate of interest. The money borrowed at 4½ per cent. or at £4 14s. 5d. per cent. is cheap money, and we cannot borrow it at the same rate to-day. The Treasurer has stated it is difficult to get money from the Old Country, because the rate of exchange is against us. There is any amount of money there for borrowing purposes, but it cannot be availed

of. It has, therefore, been found necessary to go upon the Australian market to liquidate a loan of £1,000,000 falling due in January next. We have to pay 5½ per cent. for that because we cannot secure the transmission of money from London at a fair rate of interest.

Hon. A. Lovekin: What are you paying for money in London?

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: I cannot say at the moment. The State Government have placed before the Federal authorities a reasonable proposition. If we cannot secure the consent of the Federal Government to that proposal, it will be to the disadvantage of Western Australia. Hon. members should realise it is not reasonable to place the Government at a disadvantage at the present moment. I know hon. members do not wish to do that; they are as desirous for the advancement of the State as are the Government. If we do not carry out that arrangement, which means, I admit, the borrowing of money to pay interest, the alternative amounts to the same thing, for if we have to pay the £140,000 in cash, we will have to borrow money to replace the cash so paid out.

Hon. G. W. Miles: But it would be recorded in the deficit.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: Hon. members must realise that this money has been cheap.

Hon. A. Lovekin: You would not regard it as cheap if you had to pay 5½ per cent. for Treasury bills?

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: It has not been charged with that figure. The amount has been £4 14s. 5d. on the three millions.

Hon. J. Cornell: What will be the rate of interest on the £140,000?

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: That will be met by Treasury bills and the interest to be paid will, I presume, be at current rates.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: Your remarks regarding the three millions amount to an argument against yourself.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: That is not so.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: You have had the advantage of three millions of cheap money since 1914.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: The Committee must understand that the Government were not apprised of the position until a few months ago. We did not know till then that we had to make up this discrepancy. It was a great shock to the Treasurer when he found out he had to make this money available to the Commonwealth Government.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: The fact remains that for that period you had the advantage of so much cheap money.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: Now Mr. Holmes would insist upon the Government paying cash in refunding the £140,000 to the Federal authorities! Is it a fair thing that the Government should be forced to re-

pay that amount in cash? It simply means that if we have to borrow money to replace the cash we have to pay out, it is merely a matter of fifty-fifty. What will be the advantage? I realise that it is only a matter of principle that actuates Mr. Lovekin and Mr. Holmes and those who support those hon. members. I admit that it is a pernicious principle to pay interest with borrowed money, but I wish hon. members to realise the position in which the Government have been placed. I trust they will not carry this beyond an expression of their objection to that method of finance. I am sure the Treasurer will agree that it is not a wise policy to borrow money to pay interest. We are all agreed on that point, but the fact remains that the position is as I have indicated to hon. members. I regret that when I moved the second reading of the Bill this clause escaped my attention, because I know the Premier wished the Bill to go through as quickly as possible. I have been taken to task by Mr. Lovekin and others for my neglect to deal with the matter on that occasion. It was not because I did not understand it or that I did not desire to place the matter before hon. members. I thought I could explain the position later on, and that the House would agree to my request that they should not delay the passage of the measure. I made a mistake. I realise that I should have explained the position then. I ask hon. members now to accept the clause and enable the Government to secure the accommodation that the Federal Government are willing to give us.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: I hope Mr. Lovekin will press his amendment. I wish to correct what I think is a wrong impression that may have been created in the minds of hon. members by the Leader of the House. It will not be necessary, as he suggested, to borrow £140,000 to pay this amount. It can be paid out of revenue. We are told that we have a buoyant revenue and that it is coming in from the railways and other quarters, in a way that was not anticipated. We are told that we are hundreds of thousands of pounds better off than the Treasurer anticipated would be the position at this period of the year. For the Leader of the House to suggest that with a revenue of 7½ millions, it is necessary to borrow £140,000 to pay off this amount is absurd. The amount should be paid out of revenue. It may have some effect on the deficit at the end of the year, but any Government must meet any and every obligation as it falls due. If we are to keep down the deficit by borrowing money, we will have a disappearing deficit.

Hon. J. Cornell: If this had been a windfall it would have been paid into revenue by the Government.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: Quite so, and the present Government would have claimed credit for it and not given that credit to the Labour Government who borrowed the money. I wish to disabuse the mind of the Leader of the House on that point. We must pay this

amount from revenue and it will appear in the deficit. I hope that, despite the fact that £140,000 will have to be paid from revenue, there will be no deficit at all at the end of the year.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: I am not sure that the Minister's suggested financing is quite good.

The Minister for Education: It is as good as yours.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: He suggested that 5½ per cent. would be paid on Treasury bills, or that the payment would be at current rates.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: That is offered free of Federal and State income tax.

Hon. E. H. Harris: Only to the end of the year.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: The Government have an overdraft in London and they are paying a little less than 4 per cent. on that overdraft. I also know that money is to be had in London on bonds at 5 per cent. Rather than give the Treasury bonds at 5½ per cent. for a period of 10 years, it would be better to borrow the money on overdraft, which is cheaper, or at 5 per cent. on bonds and transfer the money here. It could be transferred at 1 per cent.

The Minister for Education: Every financial institution is against you on that point.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: I think I could do it a bit cheaper for the State. If I were handling the business, I would pay on the transfer for the one transaction. That would be better than paying the extra half per cent. for a period of 10 years. By doing as I suggest, the 1 per cent. would be paid on the transfer of the money on the one transaction.

The Minister for Education: That is only a supposititious case.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: The principle is wrong all the same.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: Of course it is. I know the Government are not paying 4 per cent. on their overdraft in London to-day. The Government could finance the business in that way and save something on the deal. I am not sure that the Commonwealth Government are giving a fair deal to the State when they allow this loan to continue year after year while money is cheap and now that money is scarce in Australia to demand that Western Australia must pay up. This is not the time when the Commonwealth should demand their pound of flesh. I do not think the Commonwealth should press the State at this disadvantageous time. I must press the amendment as one of the representatives of the section of the people who have to pay this amount. I adhere to what I said formerly when I declared that the principle of borrowing to pay interest is pernicious, and should not be agreed to without strong protest.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: I neglected to read a letter received by the Under Treasurer from the Under Treasurer of South Australia. It shows that the position of South Australia, in common with Western

Australia and the other States, is practically on all fours. The letter is as follows:—

Re loan of £18,000,000 to States from Commonwealth Government. I am in receipt of your favour of the 4th inst. and have been unable to reply thereto before now as matters had not been finalised. Our share of the loan was £2,600,000, and our arrears of interest thereon amounted to £106,907 2s. 10d. as at 31st March, 1923. We have offered to pay in cash the odd £907 2s. 10d. (with interest to date of payment), and have requested that the balance of £106,000 should be funded and that such funded loan should mature on 15th November, 1925 (which is the anniversary date of one of the instalments of the original loan). Interest on the funded loan and on the odd amount of £907 2s. 10d. would be at the rate of £4 14s. 5d. per cent. from 1st April, 1923. We received a letter from the Commonwealth Bank, Sydney, similar to that received by you and have advised them to the above effect. The arrears of interest claimed by the Commonwealth Bank at the rate of 11s. 11d. per cent. (i.e., £4 14s. 5d. per cent. less £4 2s. 6d. per cent. already paid) on the instalments of the original loan of £2,600,000 from 1st April, 1923, up to various dates, as shown, amounted in all to £3,897 3s. 1d. and this sum has been paid to the bank.

The arrangement suggested by the Treasurer in South Australia is practically the same as that now being considered by the Government here. Western Australian is in practically the same position as all the other States. As to Mr. Holmes' statement that we have plenty of money coming in, he knows full well we have a deficit, but it is pleasing to know that the deficit is decreasing each month.

Hon. J. CORNELL: I am puzzled to know why such a thing should appear in the tail of a Loan Bill. I presume the £3,100,000 is part of the £14,000,000 worth of Treasury bonds that do not carry sinking fund, and this is one of the factors making for the alleged reduced deficit. All borrowed money should be subject to sinking fund charges, so that the true position of the finances may be ascertained. This interest should be paid out of revenue. Then if the revenue at the end of the year proved to be short, the shortage could be funded and subjected to sinking fund charges. The community are under the impression that sinking fund is provided for all loans. This Bill is a sort of open cheque. We should delete the clause and let the Government bring down a special Bill showing exactly what is required to meet this obligation.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: The Minister said a similar position had arisen in South Australia. From the letter he read I assume the position is similar only in the respect that a claim has been made against the South Australian Government also. There is no suggestion that the Government there propose to deal with the payment of interest

as is proposed here. I presume the South Australian Government will pay the interest out of revenue.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: I did not say the position in South Australia was similar. It is the intention of the South Australian Government to fund the money, and they must do it by issuing Treasury bonds, or in some other way. Evidently it is their intention to borrow the money.

Hon. G. W. MILES: While I sympathise with the Government in having to find this money, we would be wanting in our duty if we did not support the amendment, and thus record our disapproval of borrowing money to pay interest. This money should come out of revenue.

Hon. H. SEDDON: I support the amendment because of the principle involved. This State has a high reputation in financial circles because it has provided sinking funds. If we permit this procedure to be adopted, our reputation may be impaired.

Hon. H. STEWART: When the Bill was introduced the Minister did not direct attention to this clause. He asked us to pass the Bill quickly. Has this matter been made clear to another place? If we request an amendment we shall know that the attention of another place has been drawn to the clause, though we may not be able to insist upon our amendment at a later stage. I support the amendment.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: The Bill was introduced in another place by the Premier, and I am sure he explained the position clearly.

Hon. G. POTTER: I sympathise with the Government. Still, there is a conflict between principle and method, and principle must prevail. I support the amendment.

Hon. J. CORNELL: In view of the approaching general election and the excellent hope that Labour have of succeeding to the Treasury benches, is it likely they would debate such a provision? It is more reasonable to think they would prefer to have the business fixed up before they took office.

Amendment put and passed, the clause, as amended, agreed to.

Schedules 1 to 3—agreed to.

Bill reported with an amendment and a message accordingly forwarded to the Assembly requesting them to make the amendment, leave being given to sit again on receipt of a message from the Assembly.

BILL—ARCHITECTS ACT AMENDMENT.

Second Reading.

Hon. F. E. S. WILLMOTT (South-West) [8.33] in moving the second reading said: This is a temporary measure to right a wrong. Certain worthy people were placed at a great disadvantage by the passing of the Architects Act. About 12 who were articulated prior to the war found themselves

suffering from a disability, and when we think of the large premiums paid by them, it seems hard indeed that they should be put to the trouble and annoyance of having to pass a purely academic examination when in all good faith they paid large premiums to be trained in the profession of an architect. The measure sets out to right that wrong. It will cease to operate six months after the Bill becomes an Act, or when the people to whom I have referred have come to the end of their articulated term and have received a certificate that will declare they have served their time. Of course any architect of standing when signing that certificate will see that they are fit and proper people to belong to the profession. Any new contracts that may have been entered into will not be affected, because at that time these people were aware that the Act was in existence and were prepared to be called upon to pass a statutory examination which includes knowledge of a foreign language. It must be apparent to hon. members that to have this suddenly sprung upon men who have served $2\frac{1}{2}$ years in their articles, is not altogether fair.

Hon. R. J. Lynn: There is no opposition to it.

Hon. A. J. H. Saw: Did they pass any examination other than the academic?

Hon. F. E. S. WILLMOTT: No. What may interest members is the fact that not one of the gentlemen who is now on the Architects Board has passed that or any other examination. The injustice to which I have referred will be removed if the House agrees to the Bill. I am sure no hon. member wishes to see an injustice done to any member of the community. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee, etc.

Bill passed through Committee without debate, reported without amendment, and the report adopted.

Read a third time and passed.

BILL—LAND ACT AMENDMENT.

Second Reading.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION (Hon. J. Ewing—South-West) [8.40] in moving the second reading said: It is necessary in order to get land settled that the existing conditions should be made more stringent. It is desired that the period allowed in which to carry out improvements should be shortened. Under parts 5 and 6 of the Land Act, one-fifth of the improvements to non-residential conditional purchase leases must be made within two years and to the extent of one-fifth of the purchase money. It has been found that persons who have land under conditional purchase conditions, residential or non-residential have waited for the end of the two years

before starting to make their improvements. The Government desire to compel the holders to make a commencement with the improvements not later than six months from the day of approval being granted. This will permit of the country being opened up and improved much more rapidly than has been the case in the past. The demand for land has been so considerable of late that it is considered no man should hold his areas for such a long time without beginning to carry out the improvements required by the Act. The principal feature of the Bill is in regard to pastoral leases. At the present time there are a number of holders of areas who have not applied to come under the provisions of the 1917 Act which will enable them to extend the period of their leaseholds to 1948 from 1928, when ordinarily the leases would have expired. The State will derive considerable advantage from the extension of these leases, because it is provided that 7 per cent. interest has to be paid on the additional rental.

Hon. G. W. Miles: That is compound interest.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: Yes. Hon. members will understand that a considerable concession will be given to these people if they are allowed to come under the 1918 Act, which gives them a tenure until 1948.

Hon. W. W. Miles: If they pay double rent and are appraised at the old rent there will be no refund?

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: No. Lessees holding over 1,000,000 acres will be required to transfer the surplus. It has been pointed out to the Government that some of the pastoralists concerned were out of the State, and that others did not get in in time, losing the opportunity, to a certain extent, through no fault of their own.

Hon. H. Stewart: They had 12 months' extension over the first period of 12 months.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: Yes. It is for hon. members to decide whether it is a fair thing to allow them to come under the 1917 Act on the conditions I have stated. It is argued that that course will be in the best interests of the State. The advantages which the arrangement will confer on the State are very considerable. I do not see who can be hurt or disadvantaged. The measure will assist in stocking, since it will make financing easier. If a man has a lease expiring in 1928, he will have great difficulty in getting the necessary money to stock his leasehold fully. A man with such a lease would not be able to get from Dalgety's or Elder Shenton an advance that would be of real use to him. Thus he will not be able to purchase stock, and, therefore, he will suffer, and the State also will suffer. That is the principal argument in favour of the proposed extension. Another argument of the Government is the increased revenue which will result—I think from £8,000 to £10,000 a year. Moreover, the pastoralists will not in future be able to get 10s. per acre land appraised at 15s. an acre.

Hon. G. W. Miles: They will have to pay the rent appraised, or else double the present rent, whichever is higher.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: Yes. It will be a great asset to the State if these pastoralists are enabled to stock their stations adequately. I have laid on the Table of the House a list of the pastoralists concerned, giving their names and the areas held. There is not on the list a leasehold of 1,000,000 acres. One goes up to 900,000 acres, but that is the highest. However, the list is there for the inspection of hon. members. The great number of the leases are small in area, and held by very deserving people. The Bill affects 65 lessees holding 186 leases, and these 186 leases cover 6,000,000 acres out of 300,000,000 acres. Thus the Bill does not affect a large proportion of the pastoral area of Western Australia. The Premier, in another place, pointed out that this State still has an enormous area of land available for pastoral purposes. We desire to encourage people to go in for pastoral pursuits, especially in the North-West. In passing, I may remark that it is a very fine thing to be connected with the sheep industry of Western Australia to-day, having regard to the price of wool. It is gratifying to the State that such wonderful wool should be produced in the South-West and at Wagin. Hon. members recently emphasised the fact that settlers on the wheat belt are going in for sheep. In doing that, those settlers can hardly go wrong. It should be clearly understood that the people who are to get advantages under this Bill will have to pay for them. If Parliament did not realise the fairness of the case, the majority of the lessees affected would have no one to blame except themselves. However, it is to the advantage of Western Australia to rectify the position and thus add to the wealth of the lessees and of the State. If hon. members pass the Bill, they will have nothing to be sorry for. The measure is one making very considerably for the advancement of the North-West. Mr. Holmes has spoken to me about this Bill, and has intimated that there is an amendment which he thinks should be made in it for the benefit of the State. The amendment has been submitted to the Solicitor General, and he advises me to move it. I shall have pleasure in doing so when the Bill is in Committee. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES (North) [8.58]: Any member who has been in the House from 1917 onwards will be aware of the position I have taken up with regard to pastoral leases. When I heard that another Bill to amend the Land Act in regard to pastoral leases was being brought down, I said, "Here is another fight, and I am going to be in the fight." However, I have gone into the question very carefully. I have made inquiries at the Lands Department, and I was instrumental in having various papers bearing on the subject placed upon the Table of the House. Further, I have consulted the Solicitor General

in the matter. Now I wish to put before the House the position as it appears to me. The Minister has stated that 300,000,000 acres of pastoral country have been leased under the 1917 Act, and that this Bill refers to 6,000,000 acres held by 65 lessees who did not avail themselves of the opportunity afforded by the amendment Act of 1917 to surrender leases expiring in 1928 and obtain leases expiring in 1948. I leave the agricultural representatives to deal with the agricultural portion of this Bill: I shall deal solely with the portion referring to pastoral leases. First of all let me say that there is no legal obligation on this House to grant the suggested extension. Possibly there may be a moral obligation as regards the 65 lessees. Hon. members will of course understand that there is no legal obligation: otherwise there would be no occasion for this Bill. The amendment referred to by the Minister is an important one, if we consider the position generally of the pastoral leases. In 1917 the pastoral lessees pointed out that with only 10 years further tenancy they could not make any more improvements, and that nobody would take up new country on a 10 years' lease. The Act of 1917 was approved by the pastoralists. Under that measure those holding over a million acres, if they availed themselves of the Act, would have to dispose of everything above a million acres. The Act provided that the pastoral lessees should avail themselves of the extension to 1948 and be satisfied with a million acres or, alternatively, should hold the lot until 1928 and then walk out. In 1918 another Bill was passed granting an extension of the time during which surplus areas over a million acres were to be sold, until 12 months after the conclusion of the war. But one section of the pastoralists discovered a flaw in the 1917 Act. That Act declared that no person or combination of persons could be beneficially interested in more than a million acres. Those, or some of them, who discovered the flaw, formed themselves into limited companies and continued to hang on to their original holdings, setting up the plea that, as shareholders in a company, they were not beneficially interested in the lease.

Hon. E. H. Harris: Did the Legislature contemplate that?

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: No, but the interpretation was accepted by the then Attorney General, Mr. R. T. Robinson. The question to be fought out sooner or later is whether those shareholders are beneficially interested in the leases. Subclause 2 of Clause 3 of the Bill provides—

All pastoral leases granted under the provisions of Subsection 4 of Section 30 of the Land Act Amendment Act, 1917, and Section 2 of the Land Act Amendment Act, 1918, shall be for a term commencing the 1st day of April, 1918, and all leases heretofore granted for a term commencing on the 1st day of April, 1918, shall be deemed to have been lawfully granted and shall have effect accordingly.

If we pass that clause without amendment we shall legalise anything that may have been done. Remember, we are dealing, not with the six million acres, but with 294 million acres. What the Government require to do is to fix the date of all the leases at the 1st April, 1918, and not leave it open for a man to say that his lease dated from 1920. But the Government have gone further and propose to legalise everything done, whether done lawfully or not. The Crown Solicitor suggests, and the Premier and the Minister for Education agree, that the following amendment should be inserted:—

That after "shall" in the second line, the following be inserted:—"as regards the date of commencement."

It is an important amendment.

Hon. H. Stewart: Be mighty careful to see that it achieves its object.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: The Crown Solicitor says it is necessary, because he does not want all sorts of actions that will inevitably be set up if the Bill be passed without amendment. With the amendment, the Bill will merely legalise the date as from the 1st April, 1918, until the 31st March, 1948. Mr. Stewart says we must watch the thing closely. Well, I cannot do more than go to the Crown Law Department, explain the position, and put the result of my interview before the Chamber. We had the same trouble in the 1918 Bill. Mr. Angwin discovered the need for amendment, and took the necessary precautions. The amendment moved by Mr. Angwin in another place was agreed to here. What that Bill really proposes to do is to allow 65 leaseholders to come under the provisions of the 1917 Act. The lessees had the right up to a certain date to come under the Act, but for various reasons they did not do so. Some of them, hundreds of miles from a port, have a mail about once a year. Possibly some of them did not know that the Act had been amended. Others held on, hoping for something to turn up. Still others genuinely tried to sell and did sell, but a few could not sell until after the expiry of the date upon which they were to come under the Act. A number of the 65 lessees are small holders. Three of them hold about half-a-million acres each, and one syndicate holds nearly a million acres. That big lease of 900,000 acres, with a number of other leases in Kimberley, was held by the Emanuel Brothers. Emanuel Brothers were the only big holders in Western Australia that did not take advantage of the defect in the Act and form a limited company. More honourable men than Emanuel Brothers I have never met. Yet they were practically driven out of the State because, in those days, it was considered a crime to be prosperous. It is not much better to-day. Emanuel Brothers advertised their surplus over a million acres in Sydney in about 1919, but the times were bad and I do not think they got a bid. Subsequently they sold one station privately here, and another to a syndicate representing half-a-dozen local residents.

But the area passed out of the Emanuel's hands into the hands of the syndicate after the date on which the syndicate could have applied to bring the lease under the Act. Because of that, they cannot get any longer tenure than 1928, except under the Bill now before us.

The Minister for Education: It is reasonable to give it to them.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: Assuming we refuse this extension, what is the position? We shall hold up this lease until 1928. The restrictions as to the stocking and improvements under the 1917 Act, extending to 1948, cannot then be applied to these leases, because they will not come under the 1917 Land Act. The old conditions as to limited stocking and improvement apply to the leases expiring in 1928. The owners of these leases will in 1928 be tenants in possession, and one would naturally think they would be entitled to an extension until 1948, under terms and conditions to be stipulated by the Government. If the stocking and improvement conditions were held up until 1928 the Government would then be morally bound to grant the extension. Even the 900,000-acre lease, to which I have referred, comes within the provisions of the 1917 Act, which permits a person to hold 1,000,000 acres. There can be no valid objection to renewing the lease in 1928. It would only resolve itself into a question of giving the Government the right to get more rent at the end of 1928 than they are getting now, by squeezing these people. The Government might get more rent, but meantime would be holding up the stocking conditions and improvement conditions. They would also place these people in doubt as to what would happen to their leases in 1928, whereupon they would cease to make any improvements, and in self-defence would be bound to get rid of their stock. On a million acres somewhere about 40,000 sheep could be carried in the Kimberleys, but what would be the use of them if the owners had not an acre of ground in 1928 on which to keep them? What I have been watching is this, that we should not amend the Land Act to legalise anything that has been wrongfully done. My amendment, I think, fixes that. This Bill, with my amendments, should not meet with much opposition.

Hon. F. E. S. WILLMOTT (South-West) [9.18]: I have gone carefully into this matter, and was brought into touch with it when I was in another place in 1917. There are one or two points Mr. Holmes has not stressed. He said the 1917 Act empowered squatters to come under the 1948 provisions and gave them 12 months in which to do so. He then pointed out that in 1918 a further 12 months' extension was given them, but he did not tell the House that, in order to take advantage of this extension, they had to pay double rent.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: The Minister stated that.

Hon. F. E. S. WILLMOTT: The proposal is that up to 30th June next double the rent, plus 7 per cent. interest as a penalty, shall be paid. That is a fairly severe penalty when we consider that the holders of these 6,000,000 acres had no chance of coming under the Act. People in the street ask why the leaseholders did not take advantage of the Act. They could not do so because they were not the owners of the leases at the time. Cases came under my notice where leaseholders did not know that any legislation had been before Parliament. These people will come under the improved stocking conditions of 1917, which do not apply to them at present. In 1928 this will have a serious effect upon them. One aspect of the case always troubled me when I was honorary Minister for Lands. I very much doubt, from my reading of the Act, if the Government have any legal right to turn these people off their holdings in 1928, and to put on others to carry on the same industry.

The Minister for Education: They would have to pay for the improvements.

Hon. F. E. S. WILLMOTT: They would have to do that in any case. Can the Government, under the Act, turn Jones, a pastoralist, off his holding, and put upon it Brown, another pastoralist? Land can be resumed from the present owners only for discharged soldiers or for agricultural purposes. We have full power under Section 4 of the 1906 Act to resume for agricultural and mining purposes. If the Bill is agreed to, the stocking conditions will come into force. As they will date back to 1918, this year the full improvements, both as to stocking and improvements, will have to be effected. The rate will be £5 per thousand acres for the first five years, and £10 per thousand acres for the second five years. These improvements will have to be maintained.

Hon. G. W. Miles: And the stocking conditions as well.

Hon. F. E. S. WILLMOTT: Under the old Act pastoralists had to stock their land. It was not said that the stock had to be maintained on the leases. I know of stock being placed on a lease, inspected and approved, and then removed from the lease, and not another hoof put upon it for many years. That was a direct evasion of the Act, but cannot be done under this Bill. The stocking conditions provide for ten head of sheep, one head of large stock, and an expenditure of £5 per thousand acres. The only penalty, if this was not done, was double rent, not the forfeiture of the lease. Now, if it is not done the lease can be forfeited. I wish to refer to the clause dealing with conditional purchase. It has been found that as a man gets his land rent free for the first five years he can, under the non-residential clause, avoid effecting any improvements.

The Minister for Education: For two years.

Hon. F. E. S. WILLMOTT: The Bill will stop that. A man cannot take up land

under the non-residential clause as conditional purchase and sit back for two years without doing anything. As we want our land brought under cultivation, this is a good clause. No hardship will be done, because the Minister, under the Act, has the right to grant exemptions where good cases are made out. It is necessary, in some cases, to grant such exemptions. Let me instance the coastal land in the vicinity of Augusta. Where there is sandy coastal land, if the plough is put into it, it is turned into a sand patch. If people adhere strictly to the Land Act they have to put the plough into the land, which means ruining the country for grazing purposes. The Minister has power to exempt people from doing this and destroying the natural herbage. In the vicinity of the Margaret River one can see sandhills that have been cultivated, and the effect of such cultivation. These people did not know the Minister could grant exemption, so they cultivated the land and destroyed the herbage. The land now resembles that at Fremantle, where so much damage has been caused. The Bill will tighten up the conditional purchase conditions, and give the people concerned a chance of having their leases extended until 1948. Seeing that 250,000,000 acres of leases have been extended to 1948 we should allow these other people to have their leases brought up to the same period. It must not be forgotten that the leases will be re-appraised 15 years from 1917.

Hon. G. W. MILES (North) [9.27]: When the amending Land Bill was before the House in 1917 and 1918, I said the pastoralists did not want anything for nothing, and were prepared to pay for the increased security of tenure to 1948. When the Bill went through I told a few of the pastoralists whose leases could be extended by that Act that they would be mad not to come under its provisions, and that their security was depreciating each year. Under ordinary conditions their leases would expire in 1928, and I told them that if they neglected the opportunity thus afforded them the State would be entitled to any increment accruing up to 1928. Some leaseholders bought from others who held big areas, and the holders of the big areas sold their leases at a nominal price. As the leases were expiring in 1928 they were not worth as much as those expiring in 1948. When this Bill goes through, it will appreciate the value of the 1928 leases by 20 or 30 per cent. In my opinion the Government are entitled to more than double rent, together with the compound interest provided. Mr. Willmott has pointed out that by coming within the scope of the 1948 tenure, the stocking and improvement clauses, as well as other conditions, have to be maintained, whereas under the old leases that was not the case. If a man had 1,000 sheep on his area at one period and if he sold those sheep there was no provision to compel him to maintain the stocking conditions under the old lease. The Minister also

pointed out that pastoral lessees could not obtain money to finance their properties if they had such short tenures and that if the leases were extended to 1948, the security would be so much improved that they could get the necessary advances to enable them to improve their holdings. The position has been placed clearly before hon. members and I am glad that Mr. Holmes has delved into it sufficiently to find out that it is necessary to insert the amendment that has been indicated. We should not legalise anything that has been wrongly done in the past.

Hon. H. Stewart: Do you think the Government are getting sufficient out of this by merely imposing double rental and compound interest?

Hon. G. W. MILES: I think the Government are entitled to a lot more.

The Minister for Education: As it is, the amount will be fairly substantial.

Hon. G. W. MILES: So it should be. Men who come under the new legislation will know, generally speaking, what will be their re-appraisal, judging by the experience of those around them.

Hon. H. Stewart: If some of these leases expired in 1928, would not the Government be able to call for tenders and secure more money in that way?

The Minister for Education: No hope.

Hon. G. W. MILES: Had the leases expired in 1928, the Government would have had to pay for improvements and the stock on the holdings, and then call for tenders for the re-leasing of the properties.

Hon. F. E. S. Willmott: It is a risky thing to do under the Act. I think the Government would find themselves before the Privy Council in no time.

Hon. G. W. MILES: I do not think so. The Kimberley country is different from the North-West and the Murchison. There are some men in the Kimberleys who wish to get hold of smaller properties. Some men have applied for the forfeiture of leases owing to non-compliance with the stocking provisions. I have an extract from a communication from the Under Secretary for Lands indicating that it was difficult to forfeit under the old conditions and pointing out that under the 1948 tenure, if the lessees did not comply with the stocking clause and the maintenance of their improvements, the leases would be liable to forfeiture.

Hon. H. Stewart: Does not one, if not a number, of the leases cover one of the most valuable portions of the Kimberley area for closer settlement, inasmuch as it runs along permanent water courses?

Hon. G. W. MILES: I have all along desired to keep an open mind on this question and for that reason I have not perused the list of lessees, which has been tabled. I know only from hearsay who are interested in the six million acres concerned. There is a section of the Kimberley area that will be useful for closer settlement purposes.

Hon. F. E. S. Willmott: We have the right to resume at any time for closer settlement purposes.

Hon. G. W. MILES: That is so. I have in mind people who did not come under the 1948 tenure. It has been suggested that the Government should take advantage of the opportunity to cut up holdings into smaller properties. I do not think we can limit a man to a small area in the Gascoyne or Murchison areas, for those are entirely different propositions. If areas were cut down to smaller holdings than obtain to-day, making it impossible to hold more than, say, 100,000 acres, it would not be right to say to a man who had fully improved his holding that he must sit down and not be permitted to develop any further land.

Member: You would stop at a million acres.

Hon. G. W. MILES: I would, because that is sufficient for any one man to hold. If anyone offered a small man £10,000 for a holding worth only £5,000, he would take it and the big landholder could come into possession of it. In the Pilbara district, for instance, the De Grey Pastoral Co. owned practically the whole of the De Grey River area. Most of the boys who were trained on the station took up portion of the original holding and established stations such as Mulyie, Muecan, Pardoo, Warralong, Bungalow and Ettrick. During the last 10 years the balance of the De Grey holding has been disposed of to Reuben, who, during the war, spent more money than anyone else in developing his holdings. Since that time he has acquired other stations including Mulyie and Ettrick. There is no objection to a man securing land so long as his total holding is under a million acres and so long as he is prepared to develop it. As I have already indicated, the pastoralists are not asking something for nothing. They are prepared to pay for what they receive. I believe they would have been prepared to pay far more than the Government asked for under the Bill.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Hon. J. W. Kirwan in the Chair; the Minister for Education in charge of the Bill.

Clauses 1 and 2—agreed to.

Clause 3—Pastoral leases:

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: I move an amendment—

That in line 6 of Subclause 2 after "shall" the words "as regards the date of the commencement thereof" be inserted.

Amendment put and passed.

Hon. H. STEWART: I was interested in Mr. Miles' explanation regarding the attitude of the pastoralists and the fact that the Government could have secured a larger sum

of money from the extension of these leases than is contemplated by the Bill. I believe the Government would have been justified in asking for a larger return. I do not suggest that that should have been at the expense of people who were not in a position to take advantage of the legislation passed during 1917, 1918 and 1919. There are other instances, however, where the lessees will undoubtedly get the advantage of a fine asset.

The Minister for Education: It would be difficult to differentiate between the two sets of leaseholders.

Hon. F. E. S. Willott: It is not a good argument to say that because you have a man down, with his hand tied, you should kick him.

Hon. H. STEWART: Let me tell hon. members who were not in the House at the time that, when the 1917 Land Act Amendment Act was passed, the pastoralists were given the right for 12 months to extend the tenure of their leases to 1948. It was provided that no one should hold more than a million acres in one division. The position was made perfectly clear by the then Attorney General, Mr. R. T. Robinson. In 1918, because of war conditions which had prevented some of the lessees from exercising their rights, Parliament reasonably extended the opportunity to leaseholders for a further 12 months. During that period a number of people holding larger areas, and in defiance of the spirit of the 1917 amending legislation, took advantage of a loophole in the Act to convert themselves into companies and so were enabled to retain the larger holdings.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: Was a loophole found or was it there all the time?

Hon. H. STEWART: War conditions prevented some people from getting rid of their surplus leases, and on that ground Parliament was asked to extend the time. Within a few months of the extension, this expedient was adopted. The purchase of surplus areas was like buying bad debts, but they are turning out good. The Government could have provided for these special cases and received the additional revenue to which they were entitled.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: The Bill provides for interest at the rate of 7 per cent. per annum. That means simple interest. If it is desired to charge compound interest, the word "compound" should be inserted.

The CHAIRMAN: To do that it will be necessary to recommit the Bill.

Clause as amended agreed to.

Title—agreed to.

Bill reported with an amendment.

Recommittal.

On motion by Hon. G. W. Miles, Bill re-committed for the further consideration of Clause 3.

Clause 3—Pastoral leases:

Hon. G. W. MILES: I understand the intention is to charge compound interest. I move an amendment—

That before "interest" in Subclause 1 the word "compound" be inserted.

Hon. F. E. S. Willmott: Have you worked out what compound interest means?

Hon. G. W. MILES: People expect to pay compound interest, and I want to see the State get every penny it can.

Hon. F. E. S. WILLMOTT: Members should make a little arithmetical calculation. Let them take a million acres at a double rental, 15s. per 1,000 acres, 7 per cent. compound interest for five years, and ascertain what the rate will mean.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: The people that came under the leasing provisions of the 1917 Act have paid their money and probably created an overdraft. Surely the people coming under the Act now should pay interest for the retrospective period.

Hon. F. E. S. Willmott: They have to pay double rent from 1917.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: So did everyone else. If the double rent is more than the apportionment, they get a refund on the rent. If the double rent is less, they pay the difference. Compound interest should be stipulated.

Hon. G. W. MILES: There is a lease in the Kimberley district paying 5s. per thousand acres under the old Act. That has been paid and I understand it will be required to pay another 5s. for the last five years. That will mean about £250 per annum. Seven per cent. on that would be a fleabite. The whole thing is a gift to them.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: It was intended to charge compound interest. Therefore I hope the amendment will be agreed to.

Amendment put and passed.

Hon. H. STEWART: Members should satisfy themselves that Subclause 2 will achieve the desired object. I suggest that progress be reported to permit of further consideration.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: This matter was brought under the notice of the Solicitor General by Mr. Holmes. It was carefully considered and his opinion was clear that the position is safeguarded.

Hon. H. Stewart: That occurred in 1917.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: Subsequently the Solicitor General spent half an hour in my office, and satisfied me that the position was safeguarded. I also referred the matter to the Premier, and he assured me I could take the responsibility for moving the amendment. I again saw the Solicitor General and I do not think anything more can be done.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: The Minister has told the Committee that the Solicitor General satisfied me. I would point out, however, that I am only a layman.

Hon. H. Stewart: Do you feel satisfied?

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: I discussed the matter with the Solicitor General and the Premier. Mr. Sayer found himself faced with all manner of difficulties when I drew attention to the clause as it stood. Everything had been legalised under the Bill. Now we limit the legalisation as from the date of the commencement of the leases, and that is what the Government originally intended to do. The necessity for fixing a date is that some leases were appraised in 1918 and some in 1919, 1920 and 1921. The holders paid double rental, and in some cases the appraisal was more than double the rental. The holders were setting up the plea that they were going to pay double rental up to the time of appraisal and after that they would pay the appraised price. It is proposed now to take them back to 1918 and say, "Pay the appraised price from then." That is what the Government intended to do, but they went further unwittingly.

Hon. H. Stewart: What I wanted to know was whether the provision applied only to the leases.

Clause, as further amended, agreed to.

Bill again reported with an amendment, and the report adopted.

BILL—GERALDTON HARBOUR WORKS RAILWAY.

Second Reading.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION (Hon. J. Ewing—South-West) [10.7] in moving the second reading said: This short Bill becomes necessary in consequence of the Government having decided to improve the harbour facilities at Geraldton. An amount of £1,340,000 has been set aside for a period of 10 years to permit of improvements being made to the Geraldton harbour. The money is to be expended at intervals of 2½ years as follows:—First instalment £400,000, second instalment £390,000, and the third instalment £550,000. The proposed line is very short. It is necessary to have it, however, for the purpose of its being used in connection with the construction of the harbour works. It will eventually become a part of the railway system. It is considered by the Crown Law Department that the Bill is unnecessary, otherwise it will not be possible to proceed with the works at the harbour. The approximate cost is £10,000. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee, etc.

Bill passed through Committee without debate, reported without amendment, and the report adopted.

Read a third time and passed.

BILL—GENERAL LOAN AND INSCRIBED STOCK ACT CONTINUANCE.

Second Reading.

Debate resumed from the 5th December.

Hon. V. HAMERSLEY (East) [10.15]: I look upon this Bill as of the gravest importance. I have always been nervous lest the State, in borrowing money, should be entering into competition with private persons who wish to borrow for the development of the assets of the country. If we do not adhere fairly closely to the old rule which has governed our State borrowings for years, that the rate of interest must be kept at a low level, Western Australia may become a serious competitor with her citizens in the money market. The State has been borrowing at higher and higher rates of interest. Comparatively a few years ago all our loans were raised at about three and a half per cent. With regard to local inscribed stock the law provided that money should not be raised locally at anything over four per cent. As money became dearer, we had to amend our law and increase the rate of interest. I was very pleased when the present Premier announced, some months ago, that he intended to bring in a measure to reduce the rate of interest. Suddenly, however, he found the money market less favourable; and therefore we have this Bill. I fear we are rapidly approaching the stage when we shall be like a dog chasing its own tail. The Government are spending the money very freely. They are using up money so quickly that many of the people who have to pay high taxation in order to meet the State's interest bill are not inclined to go on with improvements or to invest more money in this country. If the people brought to Western Australia remained here, if our population were increasing year by year in as great a ratio as we hoped, then our indebtedness would not be so serious. But, seeing that our population is decreasing while our indebtedness per head is growing rapidly, I question whether we are justified in continuing this legislation and thereby enabling the Government to go on borrowing at very high rates of interest. We know that a five and a-half per cent. loan is being put upon the Australian market, free of income tax, both State and Federal. If our Government have to pay such a rate as that, what on earth will the private individual have to pay when he wishes to borrow in order to develop his propositions? We have just passed a measure dealing with pastoral leases. A pastoral lease is no use to its holder unless he can obtain money at a low rate of interest.

The Minister for Education: Pastoral leases are pretty valuable.

Hon. V. HAMERSLEY: They are pretty expensive to handle. I know the general opinion is that they are extremely lucrative, but travelling round the country one finds many people, holding numerous leases and

paying high rates of interest and getting no great returns from their properties. We hear of the successful owners of leases, but not of those who have failed. Many pastoralists at times suffer very severely from the effects of drought. That has been the experience here for many years. While there are magnificent opportunities for pastoral lessees, a pastoral lease can be worked successfully only if the holder can develop it with the aid of cheap money. I know the Government will require even more money than they are now asking for. The Government should pause, and consider seriously how much longer they are to go on borrowing money at high rates of interest, thus creating dangerous competition against the producers throughout Western Australia. I sincerely hope that during an early session we shall have the Bill which the Premier hoped to introduce during this session, reducing the rate at which the State is authorised to borrow.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee, etc.

Bill passed through Committee without debate, reported without amendment, and the report adopted.

Read a third time, and passed.

BILL—VETERINARY SURGEONS ACT AMENDMENT.

Second Reading.

Order read for the resumption of the debate from the 4th December.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clause 1—agreed to.

Clause 2—Amendment of Section 25:

Hon. W. CARROLL: With regard to the radius of 30 miles proposed by this clause, we have to bear in mind the scarcity of veterinary surgeons in this State. I believe there is not one between Kellerberrin and Kalgoorlie; I know there is not one between Kellerberrin and Northam. The cost of transporting a veterinary surgeon, frequently by motor car, represents a very heavy expense. Very often the sickness of an animal can be cured by a handy man, without the intervention of a veterinary surgeon. I move an amendment—

That "thirty," in line 9, be struck out, and "fifteen" inserted in lieu.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: I cannot accept the amendment. The Bill is very liberal as regards helping certain people along, but there is another side to the question, the side of the man who has passed his examinations as a veterinary surgeon. With

every consideration for farmers and settlers, I still regard thirty miles as a reasonable radius. Some good practical men, no doubt, will be benefited by the passing of this measure, but still they are not men who have passed examinations and obtained certificates. The amendment seems to me unreasonable.

Hon. J. DUFFELL: I support the clause as it stands, and I must express my surprise at Mr. Carroll's suggestion. Permits are granted to men to perform certain work, principally castration and dentistry. Even with a 30-mile radius the qualified veterinary surgeon will stand a poor chance of earning sufficient to keep him. Instead of 30 miles, it would be more satisfactory if we made it 50 miles. Men prosecuting this work have been travelling 70 miles and 80 miles, and can only then just make a living at the avocation.

Hon. A. J. H. SAW: The great complaint from owners of valuable stock is of the shortage of qualified veterinary surgeons. If Mr. Carroll's object be to make the few still fewer, he will achieve it by his amendment; for it will mean that any veterinary surgeon may be exposed to the competition of unqualified men without a permit residing only 15 miles away, and so the qualified men will be driven out of the country districts into the towns.

Hon. E. ROSE: I will support the clause as it stands. The 30 miles provided is a short enough distance. I agree with Dr. Saw, that if we reduce the distance to 15 miles the qualified men will be driven out of the country districts. The Bill is essentially a reasonable one.

Hon. V. HAMERSLEY: I am concerned, not so much about the qualified veterinary surgeon as about the stock owners. Many of the towns in the agricultural districts are only 15 miles apart. Whenever an animal falls sick the owner is very glad to get some help from, say, the local chemist. Under the Bill, if there be a qualified veterinary surgeon within 30 miles, no so-called unqualified man can be called in. Even at present one can never get a qualified man without having to pay at least £5 for car hire. It is good for the qualified man, and perhaps for the motor trade, but not for the stock owner. If the distance be left at 30 miles many owners will allow their animals to die rather than bring an expensive surgeon 30 miles. I will support the amendment.

Amendment put and a division taken with the following result:—

Ayes	7
Noes	12

Majority against .. 5

AYES.

Hon. V. Hamersley	Hon. H. Seddon
Hon. J. W. Hickey	Hon. F. E. S. Willmott
Hon. J. J. Holmes	Hon. W. Carroll
Hon. A. Lovekin	(Teller.)

NOES.

Hon. A. Burvill
Hon. J. Duffell
Hon. J. Ewing
Hon. E. H. Gray
Hon. R. J. Lynn
Hon. G. W. Miles
Hon. J. Nicholson

Hon. G. Potter
Hon. E. Rose
Hon. A. J. H. Saw
Hon. H. Stewart
Hon. J. M. Macfarlane
(Teller.)

Amendment thus negatived.

Clause put and passed.

Title—agreed to.

Bill reported without amendment and the report adopted.

Third Reading.

Read a third time and passed.

BILL—LAKE GRACE-NEWDEGATE RAILWAY.

Second Reading.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION (Hon. J. Ewing—South-West) [10.44] in moving the second reading said: The Bill authorises the construction of a railway from Lake Grace to Newdegate. The plans are on the Table of the House, and I have here reports that will give hon. members the fullest information. I have confidence in placing the Bill before the House because of the fact that I have recently visited this district. I did not go as far as Lake Grace, but I went a considerable distance along the railway, and saw that it was a promising district. Some of the farmers I met were under the Industries Assistance Board. They were in a bad way last year, but now they have magnificent crops. One particular crop belonging to a client of the board will probably go well over 30 bushels of wheat to the acre. It was stated that this farmer should this year be able to get out of his difficulties, and be well on the road to becoming a prosperous wheat grower. He is not situated in the best of wheat growing country, for beyond Lake Grace and up to Newdegate the land is known to be superior, from the point of view of wheat growing, but not so in respect of cattle or sheep. The length of the proposed line is 35 miles. It has been recommended by the advisory board. There is another proposition the board also recommend under certain conditions. The line is estimated to cost £140,000, if 60lb. rails are used in its construction. The Government believe that all lines in future, unless any particular railway should prove too costly and be a setback to the people concerned, should be built with 60lb rails. The engineers are also satisfied, after consulting the Commissioner of Railways, that this is the best policy to pursue and that heavier rails, such as 60lb., will more than compensate for the extra cost of the railway, because of its extra carrying capacity. That is the general policy of the Government. If 100lb. rails are used the line will provide for still greater safety for the travelling public, but we have

limited the weight of rails, for ordinary railway construction, to 60lbs.

Hon. G. W. Miles: When is it proposed to build the line.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: It will be built as soon as it is necessary.

Hon. A. Lovekin: As soon as possible you mean.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: No. The work done on the Newdegate area is not yet fully productive, but next year the district should be producing very much more. When operations are in full swing, it will be necessary to construct the line in order to carry the produce to market. I should think this railway would be built at an early date. The Government have not decided what weight of rails to use on that line. They have a number of 45lb. rails in stock, and after the most mature consideration, it may be decided to build the line with those rails. The question, however, is receiving careful consideration. The Commissioner of Railways has no doubt upon the matter. He says it is better to lay down 60lb. rails even if the cost is greater, for very much heavier loads can be carried over such a line, and it is in the interests of the cheap working of our railways to have heavier rails.

Hon. J. W. Hickey: That is quite a change.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: It is quite right, and I approve of it, because I happen to know how easily with heavy traffic a light line will go to pieces. The Government have secured rails which will enable them to carry out their policy.

Hon. J. W. Hickey: In the interests of economy and of the public.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: I am glad to have the hon. member's approval. The proposed line will serve about 15,000 acres per mile of line, and there will be under the sphere of influence of this line, 525,780 acres. There has been surveyed an area of 125,075 acres; unsurveyed first class land 7,000 acres; unsurveyed second class 105,000 acres, and unsurveyed third class land 288,705 acres. The line itself has not yet been surveyed. Mr. Holmes looks at me as if he were astonished at that. The difficulties of surveying are nil. It is easy country through which to run a line, and the route of the line has been located. The line will be built within reasonable distance of its location, but the actual permanent survey has not yet been completed. This accounts for the deviation to the north and south of the line, for it will enable the surveyors to take the proposed line two or three miles to the north or south as the necessities demand.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: You are not looking for a terminus, I hope.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: No, the surveyors are on the job now. After consultation with the engineers, I am satisfied the line will require to be deviated very little from the position it now occupies on the plan. A flying survey will be made. There are no engineering difficulties and the

location of the line cannot be altered to any extent.

Hon. J. Mills: Is it not suitable sheep or cattle country?

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: I said the land in and around Wagin is more suitable for sheep and cattle than the land further out. I believe the land at Newdegate and Lake Grace is more suitable for wheat growing than for stock raising.

Hon. H. Stewart: It is the finest wheat land in the State.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: The land to the east is more valuable for wheat growing than anything else, but in and around Wagin the country is ideal for stock raising. I saw some of the best stock there I have ever seen in Western Australia. The advisory board submitted to the Government an alternative route for a line going through Kondinin, passing eastward about 13 miles from Kalgarin, and then going in a south-easterly direction to Newdegate. The idea is to get as direct a route to Newdegate as possible. The alternative means the construction of 60 miles of railway to connect Kondinin and Newdegate.

Hon. J. W. Kirwan: As against 37 miles.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: Yes. It is clearly laid down in the report of the board that the objective is to get as direct a line to Newdegate as possible. That could be achieved by connecting it up with Lake Grace, a distance of 37 miles. The wheat would then go through Lake Grace into Wagin and from there to Collie into Bunbury, the natural port of the district. Members do agree that the natural port of a district should be made the port of shipment.

Hon. J. Mills: What about Geraldton?

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: Bunbury is a natural port for Newdegate, Lake Grace, Wagin, Narrogin and the country about there. It all trends towards Bunbury. We are hopeful we shall have extended to us in Bunbury the facilities that have already been given to Geraldton.

Hon. J. Mills: You have had all the money spent in Bunbury.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: Geraldton has a wonderful opportunity, and I wish the hon. member all sorts of luck with that port. We are not getting anything like the money spent in Bunbury that is being spent in Geraldton. I am glad to know that Bunbury is so favourably situated that it will get the trade from the districts I have referred to. Kalgarin is about 12 miles east of Kondinin, and the country is very beautiful. The suggestion was made to go from Kalgarin in an easterly direction and strike south-easterly towards Newdegate, a distance of 65 miles. It is the opinion of the Government, and my own, that it would be better to have a direct line from Kondinin eastward to Kalgarin, and tap that country with a spur line, rather than construct a railway 65 miles in length. If that is done and another line goes out eventually from

Kondinin, these lines will serve some splendid country to the eastward. The Newdegate settlers have now to cart their produce from 30 to 35 miles.

Hon. J. Duffell: How many settlers are there at Newdegate?

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: There is a considerable settlement of returned soldiers there, and these men are working very satisfactorily. The line would greatly encourage the development of the district. The proposal for a line of 65 miles from Kondinin to Newdegate would not serve such good country as would be served by a line going east from Lake Grace, nor would it serve such good country as a line going east from Kondinin through Kalgarin, and into the beautiful country there. The alternative as reported on by the advisory board is not satisfactory in the interests of the State, and does not appeal to the Government. The right thing to do is to build a short line of 35 miles and give immediate railway facilities that are so much required. A very valuable argument is put forward. It is suggested that the rails and material that would be required for a length of 65 miles could be utilised for two separate routes, one of 35 miles from Lake Grace to Newdegate, and the other a line running out 35 miles east from Kondinin. It could be absorbed on these two spur lines and would constitute a great saving to the State.

Hon. H. Seddon: What does the Commissioner of Railways say about the dead end?

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: There will be no dead end about this line, because the spur lines go out for a certain distance and later on it may be necessary to link them up by another railway running parallel with the main line.

Hon. H. Stewart: It will end at the Esperance line.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: The railway will make for the development of the wheat areas and give necessary facilities to the people settled at Newdegate. I have not particulars regarding the number of settlers there. The route suggested by the Government is the better one. I do not think it would be right, in the interests of the State, to run the line suggested from Kondinin when, with a shorter length of 35 miles, we can connect up with Lake Grace through Wagin and Collie and on to Bunbury, which is the natural port for this district. I have every confidence in placing the Bill before hon. members and I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

Hon. J. W. KIRWAN (South) [11.2]: I second the motion. Comparatively recently I discovered that Newdegate is within the province I represent in this Chamber. It is interesting to note how the industrial character of that province and of other goldfields areas to the north-east are changing. The South and North-East Provinces, which were at one time exclusively devoted to mining, are now engaged in additional occupations. For in-

stance, in many areas there has been a marvellous development; large pastoral areas are changing hands and the holders are going in for sheep. The agricultural industry also seems to be advancing from different directions towards us. It is advancing along the Eastern Goldfields line at Westonia and Southern Cross. It is advancing north from Esperance, and now from Newdegate and the south-west it is advancing towards the recognised goldfields areas. I have looked into the question of routes regarding this railway, and I do not agree with the Minister that the route chosen by the Government is the better of the two. In my opinion it would have been better had the Government gone in for a bolder policy of development and accepted the advisory board's recommendation by constructing the line from Kondinin down to Newdegate, with a view to its further extension to one of the southern ports.

Hon. A. Burvill: Yes, to Albany.

Hon. J. W. KIRWAN: Later on that line could have linked up by cross lines with the existing railway running north and south. What prompted me to speak on this matter was a letter I received from a resident of the locality who knows much more about the district than I do. I will read the letter, and perhaps the Minister will look into the statements contained in it. The letter reads—

Regarding the Bill, briefly I may say it is a great disappointment to the Kalgarin returned soldiers who are settled there, settled in more ways than one, if railway facilities are not provided to take their wheat to market. This settlement was started about three years ago. These settlers were induced to take up the land on the understanding that a railway would be built in the near future, and by the high class quality of the land.

I understand more promises than one were made regarding this railway.

The Minister for Education: They are within 12½ miles of a railway now.

Hon. J. W. KIRWAN: According to the letter that is not the position. The writer continues—

A rumour has been circulated that no such promise has been given, that they went out at their own risk. This is quite wrong. The promise of the railway is contained in "Hansard" and was given in the Assembly by the Premier last January. The further fact of nearly £80,000 having been advanced by the Agricultural Bank proves the statement. The settlement is too great a distance from a railway to permit of carting wheat and making the industry payable. The nearest railway is at Kondinin and the settlers are from 20 to 40 miles away. The land is gimlet forest soil mixed with salmon gum and consequently first class wheat land. It is about 150,000 acres in extent, and is one of the biggest wheat areas unsettled in the State. This season the returned soldier farmers will take off 5,000 acres of wheat, but how they are

going to get it to market is a serious problem. It is estimated that about 25,000 bags of wheat will be harvested, which at 4s. per bushel means £15,000. The weight would be 2,300 tons; this, at 1s. 6d. per ton to cart, would cost £5,500, a burden these men cannot bear. If the Railway Advisory Board's recommendations had been embodied in the Bill these settlers, as well as the settlers at East Jilakin, and, of course, Newdegate, would all be provided for.

It seems to me somewhat strange that the recommendation of the Railway Advisory Board was departed from.

The Minister for Education: It was not. The board made a recommendation along the lines I have indicated. What the hon. member has quoted is the alternative route.

Hon. J. W. KIRWAN: I have quoted the statement made by the writer of this letter, and if what I have heard about the matter to-day is correct, the Government are pursuing the wrong course in connection with this line. It would have been much better to build a longer length of railway because it would have served a larger number of settlers and a wider area of country. The position of an hon. member interested in such a matter, however, is that when a railway Bill is placed before him, he has to vote for the railway, irrespective of whether the route adopted is the most suitable. The Newdegate settlers will not have a railway at all if this Bill be thrown out. It is rather unfortunate, however, that the returned soldiers and others, who are settled along the suggested route from Kondinin to Newdegate, will be left in the lurch, despite the fact that they have been promised railway communication.

The Minister for Education: They will get their railway; they will not have to wait for it much longer.

Hon. J. W. KIRWAN: Unfortunately I have no confidence in promises of Governments in connection with railways. I have known of one instance where I have waited for years for a railway and it is not constructed yet.

Hon. J. M. Macfarlane: Are you referring to the Esperance-Norseman railway?

Hon. J. W. KIRWAN: Yes. In view of all the circumstances, however, I support the second reading of the Bill.

[The Deputy President took the Chair.]

Hon. R. J. LYNN (West) [11.12]: The House would be well advised to vote against the construction of this railway. When introducing the Bill the Minister furnished a good reason why the House should not agree to the measure. He said the line had not yet been surveyed.

Hon. H. Stewart: A flying survey has been made.

Hon. R. J. LYNN: During the year a select committee inquired concerning the Dwarda extension. That line was agreed to many years ago and a select committee was appointed to inquire into matters concerning

the deviation of the proposed line. That railway will not be built within the next two or three years.

The Minister for Education: It will be built very soon.

Hon. R. J. LYNN: It will not be built within the next 12 months.

The Minister for Education: Perhaps not.

Hon. R. J. LYNN: In the dying hours of a session we should not commit the State to further expenditure where there is any doubt about the proposition.

The Minister for Education: There is no doubt about this railway.

Hon. R. J. LYNN: There is a grave doubt.

The Minister for Education: Why do you say that?

Hon. R. J. LYNN: Because no survey has been made.

The Minister for Education: As a practical man you know that that is not a grave matter, in this instance.

Hon. R. J. LYNN: After the experience we have had this session alone, we should not be prompted to pass such a measure in the concluding stages of the session. The Government ask us to agree to the construction of a line that will cost £140,000. Few members—there may be one or two exceptions—know anything at all about this Bill and that the fact that no survey has been made presents additional difficulties.

The Minister for Education: The line is being surveyed now.

Hon. R. J. LYNN: That is no reason why we should commit the country to such heavy expenditure. I do not think the Minister will claim that the construction of the line is a matter of urgency and that it could not be considered within the next 12 months.

The Minister for Education: There is urgency about it.

Hon. R. J. LYNN: In that case the Bill could be hurried through early next session. The Minister emphasised that the route proposed by the Bill is the original route recommended, and that the alternative route was recommended by the Railway Advisory Board on the 13th November, 1922.

The Minister for Education: The same board made both recommendations.

Hon. R. J. LYNN: On the 13th November, 1922, the board consisted of Mr. King, Mr. Anketell, Mr. Lord and Mr. Sutton, and they recommended the route via Kalgarin and East Jilakin. Does the Bill now before the House embody the previous recommendation?

Hon. H. Stewart: Both recommendations are contained in the one report.

The Minister for Education: That is so.

Hon. R. J. LYNN: Assuming both are in the one report—I have not seen them—surely it is reasonable to ask that the survey be made before the Bill is passed.

The Minister for Education: It is seldom done.

Hon. R. J. LYNN: Perhaps it has not been done in the past, but we have seen the failure of that policy during this session. Even amongst members representing the South-East province a difference of opinion

existed regarding the route of the Dwarda-Narrogin railway. We should not hurry this Bill through. There is no urgency attached to it. How many railways are authorised and not constructed? We are told they must be built in the order in which they were authorised. This State will be unable within the next two years to raise the money necessary to construct the railways authorised. How can this railway be constructed within the next two years? No harm whatever can be done if the Bill be shelved until next session. Then we shall have more information.

Hon. H. Stewart: You will get some more information to-night.

Hon. R. J. LYNN: The hon. member no doubt had a pleasurable time visiting the locality with the Leader of the House.

Hon. H. Stewart: No, the Minister did not get there.

Hon. R. J. LYNN: Then the Minister knows nothing about it.

Hon. H. Stewart: You are rather ridiculous.

Hon. R. J. LYNN: It seems ridiculous for the Minister to be recommending an expenditure of £140,000 to build a railway to a place he has never seen.

Hon. H. Stewart: You are speaking without having any information.

Hon. R. J. LYNN: I am speaking on the information submitted by the Minister in introducing the Bill. Next session the hon. member may be able to give us more detail from the seat now occupied by the Minister. On the information given we are not justified in passing the Bill. A private letter came into my possession, something on the lines of the letter read by Mr. Kirwan. It says there are 25,000 bags of wheat at distances of 20 to 40 miles from a railway. I have no desire to block the construction of this line. The pioneers are entitled to all possible consideration. I have never been one to refuse to support the people who go out and pioneer the country, but if there is any doubt—

The Minister for Education: There is no doubt.

Hon. R. J. LYNN: There is this doubt that the circular I received stated the railway was to be built from Kondinin to Newdegate via Kalgarin and East Jilakin as recommended by the advisory board. That appeals to me as showing some doubt. On the other hand, information has been given to me by Mr. Harris that a large quantity of wheat will be harvested 20 to 40 miles away. As the railway cannot possibly be constructed within the next year or two, why pass the Bill to-night? It need remain in abeyance for only six months. A majority of members are not well versed in the details. Why not give them an opportunity to ascertain whether there is any justification for the letters that have been circulated? I shall oppose the Bill.

Hon. H. STEWART (South-East) [11.22]: I can give the House some sound reasons why the Bill should be passed. If during my six years in the House I have acquired any reputation for reliability or ability to substan-

tiate my facts, my remarks should carry some weight. I shall not speak of the rival routes in any partisan spirit, but before I have finished the House will have more information than it has had on most railway Bills since I have been a member. I, too, received a circular signed by Mr. Hugh de Largie and Mr. Alex. Rankine. The ex-Senator presented it to me and discussed it with me. Settlement has extended east of Kondinin and Kulin and a little east of Lake Grace because of the discovery of a fine belt of land. Those places are in my province.

Hon. J. Cornell: Newdegate is in my province.

Hon. H. STEWART: Only during the last couple of months has it become known that Newdegate was in the hon. member's province. That was shown on the map relating to the redistribution of seats.

Hon. J. Cornell: Evidently we were not all so anxious about the future as you were.

Hon. H. STEWART: I am not prepared to deal with this matter in a spirit of levity. I mentioned to Mr. de Largie and Mr. Rankine that the Kondinin area itself was well served, and that my impression was the Government had warned the people who went out east from Kondinin and east of Kulin that they could not expect the usual treatment in the matter of facilities. The land was too patchy and they could not expect to receive Agricultural Bank advances or the usual railway facilities. They replied that a railway was promised. I shall refer to that again presently. I promised to put their case before the House, but I told them there were at Newdegate people for whom a railway had been recommended on account of the number of surveyed blocks. I asked whether they wished those settlers to be deprived of their facilities because a Bill had not been introduced to give those in the Kalgarin and Jilakin areas railway facilities. We in this Chamber cannot possibly secure the alteration of the route of the line in such a way as to serve all the people out there. If this is a good Bill, why kill it? The report, accompanied by the map I hold in my hand, has been on the Table for several days, and thus the strictures of Mr. Lynn were not justified.

The Minister for Education: The whole of the information is on the Table.

Hon. H. STEWART: That is so. The intention to construct this line has been known to the public since January of this year. The matter has not been sprung on the House suddenly. I was under the impression that the people had gone out in that easterly direction after having been warned. Amongst those who took up land there were Senator Lynch and a number of his friends. They took up large areas of land in that part of the State. Messrs. De Largie and Rankine declared that the construction of a railway was promised and I will give the circumstances under which I believe that promise was made. The Railway Advisory Board reported on serving the Newdegate area by route "A.B.," and in their report of the 3rd November, 1922, suggested an alternative

route, "B-C-D." Relatively the Newdegate "A-B" line will serve more surveyed good country than will the extra 30 miles of "B-C-D" line. After the publication of the report, the member for Williams-Narrogin (Mr. Johnston) asked a question in the Assembly with regard to the construction of the line. He desired to know whether it was the intention of the Government during that session to introduce a Bill for the construction of a railway from Kondinin to Newdegate in accordance with the recommendations of the Advisory Board, dated 13th November, 1922. The Premier replied that a Bill would be introduced next session. These, I think, are the circumstances under which the promise of railway communication was made to the settlers. Next day a paragraph appeared in the "West Australian" on the subject of new railways. It reads as follows:—

The Premier said yesterday that a wrong impression might be created by his reported reply to a question asked by Mr. Johnston in the Legislative Assembly. He was reported to have said that a Bill would be introduced next session for the construction of a railway from Kondinin to Newdegate in accordance with the recommendations of the Railway Advisory Board of the 13th November, 1922. The report of the board chiefly had reference to railway communication from Lake Grace to Newdegate which the board found would serve 15,000 acres per mile of line and about 3,770 acres per mile of first-class land classified and unclassified. The consideration of the country east of Kondinin was included, because of a previous instruction to report upon this area. The Bill to be introduced therefore, would have reference to a railway from Lake Grace to Newdegate and not to a railway from Kondinin to Newdegate.

Now I propose to give some information with regard to the Newdegate district, and I can submit this from personal experience. You, Mr. Deputy President, will realise that during visits I have made there I have gone into portion of your province. That, of course, was done in ignorance, but it is not the only portion of your province that I have visited, I am pleased to say. If there is anything I can do to assist those worthy pioneers, who happen to be in your province, I shall be only too glad to do it and also in a spirit of helpfulness to you and to your colleagues.

Hon. J. Cornell: The members of the South Province are all charitably disposed.

Hon. H. STEWART: There is a settlement at Lake Grace that is as prosperous as that in any of the other agricultural areas. In 1910 a band of men went out 40 miles ahead of the railway line and they were 20 miles from the nearest water. There was amongst them a sprinkling of Australians, but most of them were new-chum Englishmen. They went out there with their wives and families and took up wheat land on which the people of Wagin and Dumbleyung said they would all do a perish on account of a deficient

rainfall. To-day that area can compare with any other part of the wheat belt in regard to its productiveness. That district is to-day producing 80,000 bags of wheat. Only one-third of the area approximately has been cleared and the people who are there are working as quickly as they can to make the whole lot ready for cultivation. It is admitted, however, that there are more people at Newdegate than there are at Lake Grace and that within a few years if the means of marketing wheat are given, the district of Newdegate will equal in productiveness that of Lake Grace. In March of last year I was out there with the Minister for Agriculture (Mr. Maley). He went there, because three of the pioneers at Lake Grace who had been out at intervals and had explored this country, were so grateful to the State that just on the eve of the Premier's sailing for England, they told him of this area of country. Two of the men in question, Caruthers and Franks, are as fine a type of Englishmen as can be found in Western Australia. One of them who came here with a large family and very little in the way of cash resources, is to-day an exceedingly prosperous man. The land held by these men is not at Newdegate, but at Lake Grace, and they cannot possibly benefit by the extension of the railway. They are entirely disinterested. They were so persistent in their opinion of the value of the land and in their demand that there should be a Ministerial visit to that part of the State that Mr. Maley eventually agreed to go there at the first opportunity. I accompanied Mr. Maley on that trip. That land is almost entirely occupied by Australian and Imperial ex-soldiers who were carefully selected. Some of the unemployed were sent to that land to do preliminary chopping down for clearing. That was to be a tax on the land, and the land is so good that it can stand even some of the ineffective work of the unemployed. The land will not only make heavy traffic for a railway, but in the course of a few years, will make the holders of 1,000 acres of it independent. Formerly there was some poor land unutilised along the Great Southern railway, but since the days of the Lefroy Government the decrease in the price of poor land and the increase in the price of wool have caused that land to be taken up for the purpose of running sheep. The same remark applies to the second and third class land of the Lake Grace area. For nearly 60 of the 75 miles between Lake Grace and Wagin, there is hardly a block available; the land has been taken up for grazing. A man with a block of 1,000 acres, however, cannot get much revenue from it until he has a couple of hundred acres cleared. I was on the Newdegate area with his Excellency the Governor on the 21st November. The Under Secretary for Lands was there also and he told the people that the Premier would introduce a Bill for this line. The Premier had previously told the settlers that the railway would not be built until they had shown their confidence in the district by

clearing their land and producing traffic for the railway. In this case the Premier stated expressly that the settlers must first prove themselves. I have pleasure in stating, Mr. Deputy President, that these electors of your province, are doing the work right manfully. As regards the poorer land in the Lake Grace district, let me point out that the Kukerin country, until the experimental work of the present Minister for Agriculture with plots of special wheats and cultural work had been done, was regarded as an absolute failure for wheat production. The Kukerin settlers, who were in despair after 10 years of effort, have latterly told the Minister for Agriculture that with the guidance and help derived from the experimental plots started about three seasons ago they have been enabled to see their way to get clear of the Industries Assistance Board and pay all their debts. Previously the lands of second and third quality along the Dumbleyung-Kukerin line were not being utilised adequately. With cheap methods of clearing and with capital, the poorer lands can be settled. Men established on first class land can subsequently take up second and third class country, and use it for fodder crops and running sheep. Thus the second and third class lands will be gradually brought into cultivation, and the whole of the area along the railway lines utilised. This particular belt of country at Newdegate is a compact area of first class wheat land and the settlers on it have shown their bona fides. I believe there are now some 240 souls on the area. The plan which is exhibited to us shows how many blocks are held. Every holder of a block who does not occupy it has received notice that it will be forfeited if he does not reside on it and improve it within a limited period. Without such regulations we may have wheat dumps on an area for a year or so, but we shall have abandoned holdings if the railway be not authorised.

Hon. G. W. MILES: I move—

That the debate be adjourned.

Motion put, and a division taken with the following result—

Ayes	12
Noes	8
Majority for				4

AYES.

Hon. J. Duffell	Hon. J. M. Macfarlane
Hon. J. Ewing	Hon. G. W. Miles
Hon. E. H. Gray	Hon. J. Mills
Hon. J. J. Holmes	Hon. H. Seddon
Hon. A. Lovekin	Hon. F. E. S. Willmott
Hon. R. J. Lynn	Hon. J. Nicholson
	(Teller.)

NOES.

Hon. W. Carroll	Hon. E. Rose
Hon. J. Cornell	Hon. A. J. H. Saw
Hon. V. Hamersley	Hon. H. Stewart
Hon. G. Potter	Hon. A. Burvill
	(Teller.)

Motion thus passed; the debate adjourned.

BILL—VERMIN ACT AMENDMENT.

Received from the Assembly and read a first time.

BILL—LOAN, £3,763,000.

Assembly's Message.

Message from the Assembly notifying that it had declined to make the Council's requested amendment, now considered.

In Committee.

Hon. J. W. Kirwan in the Chair; the Minister for Education in charge of the Bill.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: I move—

That the Council's request be not pressed.

I do not think hon. members have any desire to embarrass the Government. Mr. Lovekin, who moved the requested amendment, has agreed to the attitude I take up. The object that hon. member had in view having been attained, he is now satisfied.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: It is true I told the Minister I did not intend to press the amendment any further. But I was speaking solely for myself. There is some small excuse for the action of the Government and, having made a protest, I am satisfied. But if in future we get a Bill asking authority to borrow money for the payment of interest, I shall oppose it as strenuously as I possibly can.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: Mr. Lovekin says he will fight to the last ditch any future Bill like this one. But if we pass this one we shall be establishing the principle, and the hon. member will have much more difficulty in fighting that principle next time. I do not want to lose the Bill.

Hon. J. Cornell: You cannot do that, for the Government will not allow it to be lost.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: Then I will vote for the pressing of the amendment.

Hon. J. CORNELL: We appear to have arrived at the parting of the ways, where members have to decide whether they shall be men or worms. Mr. Lovekin, who attacked the principle embodied in Clause 7, usually leads the charge from the front, but now it seems he is about to lead it from behind. He says he is satisfied with the protest made. In field warfare the great thing is to be able to choose one's own battleground. If members think the principle at stake is worth fighting for, it is now for them to choose their battleground. The Government cannot afford to lose the Bill.

The Minister for Education: Would the hon. member take a mean advantage of that?

Hon. J. CORNELL: The Government have taken a mean advantage of us ever since I have been in the House. It is fifty-fifty. Clause 7 is new and dangerous.

The Minister for Education: But the circumstances are exceptional.

Hon. J. CORNELL: That is what the thief said when the policeman got him. The Bill contains an innovation. Honesty, we are told, is the high road to the poor house. If members are desirous of taking advantage of the existing circumstances, as they are entitled to do, now is the time. If we force the Government to recognise the true position, there is only one way in which they can meet it, namely, by putting Clause 7 into a separate Bill. If we relinquish our advantage we shall not only sell ourselves into bondage, but in the same way will sell others who come after us. Of course another place would not agree with what we have asked them to do. The Government expect to be returned to power at the next general elections and the Opposition aspire to the same thing.

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member had better connect his remarks with the question before the Chair.

Hon. J. CORNELL: I am about to do that. It was not expected that the Government would approve of the request of this House, and the Opposition could not be expected to agree to it, because it would disturb the excellent arrangement that would exist for them if they were returned to power. I ask that we should insist upon this amendment. We should hold to what we have.

Question put and a division taken with the following result:—

Ayes	13
Noes	8

Majority for .. 5

AYES.

Hon. A. Burvill	Hon. J. Mills
Hon. W. Carroll	Hon. J. Nicholson
Hon. J. Duffell	Hon. A. J. H. Saw
Hon. J. Ewing	Hon. H. Stewart
Hon. E. H. Gray	Hon. F. E. S. Willmott
Hon. J. W. Hickey	Hon. E. Rose
Hon. A. Lovekin	(Teller.)

NOES.

Hon. V. Hamersley	Hon. G. W. Miles
Hon. J. J. Holmes	Hon. G. Potter
Hon. R. J. Lynn	Hon. H. Seddon
Hon. J. M. Macfarlane	Hon. J. Cornell
	(Teller.)

Question thus passed; the Council's requested amendment not pressed.

Preamble, Title—agreed to.

Bill reported without amendment, and the report adopted.

Third Reading.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION (Hon. J. Ewing—South-West) [12.22]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a third time.

Hon. J. CORNELL (South) [12.23]: I wish to enter my emphatic protest against this departure from the principle that has

existed since the introduction of responsible government in this State. There is a clause in this Loan Bill foreign altogether to its purport and intention as first introduced here. Extraordinary exceptions demand extraordinary methods. The proper manner in which to deal with this position is to consider this clause in a special Bill, and deal with it on its merits and in the light of the peculiar circumstances existing. I hope members will stick solidly to the lines of procedure that have been handed down to them, and see that a Loan Bill is confined to loan purposes, and that nothing foreign to its purport is allowed to be embodied in it. This is an innovation, and innovations that are introduced into Bills and disturb the customary procedure of responsible government are dangerous, and should be dealt with as special legislation. Responsible government has been built up on well ordered and sound procedure.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

ADJOURNMENT—SPECIAL.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION (Hon. J. Ewing—South-West) [12.26]: I move—

That the House at its rising adjourn until 2.30 p.m. this afternoon.

It is not my desire to hurry the work of the session. Members have done wonderfully well to-day and I am sure, if we meet at half-past two this afternoon, long before the time arrives for the Premier to go to Busselton at 11.30 to-night, the work of the session will be over. If members will assist me we should be able to adjourn in time to allow the Premier to go to Busselton.

Question put and passed.

House adjourned at 12.28 a.m. (Thursday).

Legislative Assembly,

Wednesday, 12th December, 1923.

	PAGE
Questions: Wheat production, Kondinin ...	1904
Mining Industry—1, Miners' Phthisis Act; 2, South African mines ...	1904
Stock disease and milk supply ...	1905
I.A.B. clients, as to protection ...	1905
Government Stores, saddlery purchase ...	1905
Bills: Yarramony-Eastward Railway, &c. ...	1905
Vermiln Act Amendment, Com., report ...	1905
State Trading Concerns Act Amendment, &c. ...	1908
Friendly Societies Act Amendment, Council's message ...	2017
Loan, £3,763,000, Council's requested amendment ...	2017
Vermiln Act Amendment, &c. ...	2021
Architects Act Amendment, returned ...	2021
General Loan and Inscribed Stock Act Continuance, returned ...	2021
Geraldton Harbour Works Railway, returned ...	2021
Veterinary Surgeons Act Amendment, returned ...	2021
Stamp Act Amendment, Council's requested amendment ...	2021
Land Tax and Income Tax, Council's requested amendments ...	2021

The SPEAKER took the Chair at 4.30 p.m., and read prayers.

QUESTION—WHEAT PRODUCTION, KONDININ.

Mr. HICKMOTT asked the Premier: 1, Is he aware that the new settlers east of Kondinin will have over 20,000 bags of wheat this season? 2, If so, how does he propose to assist them to get their wheat to the railway?

The PREMIER replied: 1, I accept the hon. member's statement as to the quantity available. 2, The Government do not cart wheat to the railway for farmers.

QUESTIONS (2)—MINING INDUSTRY.

Miner's Phthisis Act, Proclamation.

Mr. LUTEY asked the Minister for Mines: Is it the intention of the Government to have the Miner's Phthisis Act of last session made operative by proclamation before the 31st December next?

The PREMIER (for the Minister for Mines) replied: The matter is now under consideration, the proclamation of the Bill depending to some extent upon the date of the completion of the Commonwealth Laboratory at Kalgoorlie.

South African Mines, Inquiry.

Mr. LUTEY asked the Minister for Mines: 1, Is it the intention of the Government, as outlined by the Minister, to appoint a mining representative to inquire into the ventilation, sanitation, and working conditions of the gold mines of South Africa? 2, If so, when will the appointment be made?

The PREMIER (for the Minister for Mines) replied: 1, Yes. 2, Mr. W. Phoenix, Inspector of Mines, has been appointed, and will arrive in South Africa during February next.